Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah

(A gift for the Shīʿah)

Ḥujjat al-Islam Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Contents

Ḥujjat al-Islam Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī 1

Name and lineage 1
Birth and demise 1
Hometown 1
Childhood 1
Education 2
Personality and character 2
Dislike for status 3
Glad tidings 3
Life history 3
Children 4
Students 4
Accomplishments 5
Establishing Islamic Institutes 5
Calling for Jihād 8
Services to Islam in the field of knowledge 9
Easy books 10
Difficult books 12
Intricate books 15

Foreword 17

Introduction 19

Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī in the eyes of Sir Sayyid 21
Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah 25
Reason for the title 25
Perceived disrespect 27
Quoting narrations 27
Reliance upon *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* 28
A sincere council 28
An interesting angle to the deceit 30

Chapter one 31
The Ahl al-Sunnah are in conformity with the Qur'ān 31
The implication of the verse 31
The Shīʿah deprivation of reciting the Qur'ān 32
Why are the Shīʿah deprived of reciting the Qur'ān 34
True īmān is found in those who recite the Qur'ān appropriately 35
The reason for revelation supports this deduction 36
The majority will be considered 36
The Shīʿah defence 36
The Ahl al-Sunnah have firm belief in the Qur'ān 37
The belief of the Shīʿah regarding the Qur'ān 38
Humility and veneration belong to the Ahl al-Sunnah as well 38
If humility and veneration is implied, then the order of occurrence will be switched 39
If abundant recitation is implied, then the meaning will be correct 40
A doubt regarding the verse 41
Another benefit of this verse 41
Many verses of the Qur'ān prove the Ahl al-Sunnah are on the truth 42
The foolishness of not relying on the Qur'ān 43
This proves my point 44
The practice of the Ahl al-Bayt negates any changes having occurred in the Qur'ān 44
The lengths to which it has been narrated and circulated is proof of its authenticity 44
The wide availability of the Qur'ān clears ʿUthmān from all accusations 45
Certificate of authenticity from the Qur'ān itself 46
The results of this incorrect belief 46
The falsehood of Al-Kulaynī 47
Shīʿah interpretation of the Qur'ān being safe-guarded 48
The wisdom behind referring to the Qur'ān by the name "Reminder" 49
Negating the second Shīʿah interpretation 51
This opens the doors of assault on Islam 52
If the Jews overlook this, the Christians will not 53
A baseless interpretation to a baseless narration 55
Handing over authority to others abrogates the Qur'ān 56

The laws which the Shīʿah Imām al-Mahdī will enact 56
Affirming the belief of Khatm-e Nubuwwah 57
Ibn Bābawayh was also forced to accept the truth 59
The virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah 59
All virtues erased all that remains is sin 60
Commentary of the verse in Sūrah Tawbah 62
The meaning of grief 63
The understanding of the Shīʿah 64
The true meaning of Allah being "with" a person 66
The verse proves that assistance descended upon Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well 67
The actual course of events 69
The involuntary rectification to the truth 71
The true events of hijrah 72
Responding to the Shīʿah perception 73
The fair-minded interpretation of the verse 74
Another laughable interpretation of the Shīʿah and its refutation 75
The wording of the verse utterly silences any Shīʿah response 76
The impossibility of his condition changing 77
The status of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 80
Another Shīʿah diversion 80
The lame excuse of taqiyyah 83
Explanation of the term "صاحبه" and the claim that it does not have the same meaning of Ṣaḥābī 84
Even if ṣāḥib does not have the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī there is no harm 85
The correct implication 86
The word "*ṣāḥib*" has extra merit when compared to the word "Ṣaḥābī" 86
Shīʿah attempts to undermine the right of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to khilāfah 87

Chapter two **89**
The Promise of Succession and Authority **89**
This verse contradicts Shīʿah beliefs 89
A false promise 91
The attempt to misinterpret its meaning 92
The verse denotes dominance and authority 92
The correct tafsīr of this verse 93

The sequence of khilāfah is also established from this verse 94
This verse refers to the four Rightly Guided Khulafā 94
The basis of this verse is the sacrifices of the Muhājirīn 96
This verse also reveals the secret behind khilāfah being reserved for the Quraysh 96
This verse proves the innocence of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 97
The reasons why the order of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could not be fulfilled 98
The weight of Umar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ opinion 99
ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not the one instructed to bring the pen and paper 100
Where did the Shīʿah learn of the intention of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ 101
The khilāfah of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will be the most logical conclusion 102
This bounty was in actual fact granted to the four Khulafā' and it is through them that it was attained by others 103
"Those who are ungrateful..." refers to the ingratitude of the Shīʿah and is a miracle of the Qur'ān 104
This verse draws a tight circle around the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah, protecting it from all sides 106
Accusing the first three Khulafā' of apostasy is tantamount to accusing Allah of deceit 109
Who does "*after that - then those are the defiantly disobedient.*" refer to? 109

Chapter three 111
The lofty status of the Ṣaḥābah in the light of the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ 111
The loftiest status after the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is that of the Ṣaḥābah, and the status after risālat is that of "*hating for the sake of Allah*" 112
The wisdom of first mentioning the quality of "Hatred for Allah" before the other qualities 113
Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is also loving the beloved 114
Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is actually part of the love one has for the beloved 114
Having hatred for those who intend evil for the beloved is not a part of loving the beloved but it is the necessary outcome of this love. 114
When praising someone, the natural order is to begin with the lesser quality, then the greater one and finally the greatest quality 115

To love is easy, but to hate is difficult, especially when it is one's own relatives 116
The Ṣaḥābah are stern against Shayṭān and their inner selves 118
If someone errs due to some misunderstanding, not due to the effects of Shayṭān and the nafs, then too there is hope of him receiving reward 119
The disputes amongst the Ṣaḥābah were not due to the effects of Shayṭān and the nafs but due to this same hatred for the sake of Allah 120
The nafs can be subdued, but its nature cannot change 120
The basis of good is the rūḥ and the basis of evil is the nafs 121
The rūḥ is an entity from the realm of angles and the nafs is from the circle of the devil 121
The various stages of good or evil through which the human passes are due to the effect of the angels or shayṭān 122
When the nafs is brought under control then the level of "Forceful against the disbelievers" is attained 123
When the nafs is controlled then too do not trust 123
A person can never remain in one state 123
There is a vast difference between those sins committed when overpowered by the nafs and those committed when the nafs has been overpowered 124
Those who are stern against the disbelievers may err but Shayṭān cannot gain control over them 125
The quality of being forceful against the kuffār and compassionate amongst each other, necessitates sincerity and negates the possibility of boastfulness 126
Even the most honourable at times can regard good to be evil due to misinterpretation 126
Such praise despite the possibility of error indicates Allah's forgiveness and pleasure 128
Such praise despite the possibility of error is a slap in the face of their enemies 129
One objective of praising the Ṣaḥābah is to offend their future enemies 129
The Shī'ah are indebted to the Ṣaḥābah as well 130
Enumerating the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in the Qur'ān foretells the coming of those who will bear enmity for them 130

Promise of forgiveness and reward was unconditional 131
The meaning of īmān and the levels of conviction 131
The different levels of conviction 132
Love is only created after Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn 133
The Ṣaḥābah attained the level of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and hating for the pleasure of Allah and loving for the pleasure of Allah was rooted in their hearts 133
The purpose of the Ṣaḥābah was only to gain the pleasure of Allah 134
The love and submission of the Ṣaḥābah was of the highest level 135
Varying stages of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn 136
Differences of opinion does not contradict having compassion for each other 137
The disputes of the Ṣaḥābah were also on account of their compassion for each other 138
The credibility of the narrators upon whose narrations Shīʿism is founded 138
The reason for Allah's pleasure in this verse rests only upon Hijrah 141
The difference between hijrah to Abyssinia and hijrah to Madīnah 141
The verse refers only to the migration to Madīnah 142
This verse does not make known the pleasure of Allah but also the highest level of īmān and good deeds 143
Continuous glad tidings of Jannah can only indicate one's end being good 143
Whichever objections the Shīʿah raise against the Ṣaḥābah can be raised by the Khawārij against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 144
The Ṣaḥābah will not be disgraced on the Day of Qiyāmah, and the disbelievers and the sinful do not attain Allah's pleasure 144
The disputes between the Ṣaḥābah does not necessitate disbelief or sin of either party since both negate Allah's pleasure 145
The words of the verse: "*Superior in Rank*" establishes superiority of the Ṣaḥābah over the Imāms 147

Chapter four **149**
The belief of badā' and the confusion of the Shīʿah scholars **149**
Definitions of badā' 149
First definition 149
Second definition 149

Third definition 150
Three types of badā' 151
The difference between badā' and naskh 151
The three types of badā' each require the other 151
The consequences of the belief of badā' 152
The forgiveness of the four infallibles becomes doubtful 152
The extended absence of the final Imām is a sad plight indeed 153
Perhaps Allah experienced badā' when appointing the Imāms 153
The twelfth Imām has been deposed by Allah because of badā' 154
Refutation of badā' from the Qur'ān 154
The Shīʿah principle dictates that Allah may err but not the infallible Imāms 155
The supplication of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq against those who believe in badā' 155
After understanding the truth, it is compulsory to accept 156
The foundation of the whimsical belief of badā' 157
The harm of no teacher 158
The objective of testing man is not to gain new knowledge 158
An example from the Qur'ān of completing proof against man 161
Nubuwwah and establishing the laws of Sharīʿah is also to present a clear proof to man 162
The meaning of "*Test your affairs*" 165
A common example of eternal fortune and eternal misfortune 167
All times (i.e. past, present and future) exist collectively 168
All tenses are the same to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ 169
The past and future is all the present to Allah 170
The usage of past, present and future tenses in the Qur'ān 170
The universe is not eternal because it does not continue 171
Generally, knowledge is learnt with means and without means 172
Sometimes knowledge acquired with means is concealed because of the knowledge acquired without means 172
Sometimes knowledge of two things is acquired without means or one with means and the other without means 173
There is no precedence in the Knowledge which Allah gains without means and with means 173

The knowledge of Allah gained without means is mentioned in the past and present tense in the Qur'ān and that gained with means is mentioned in the future tense 173
Since the knowledge of man is all with means, they were addressed in the future tense 174
If Allah were to have spoken through His knowledge without means, then it would not serve as proof against them 175
The concepts of *maḥw* (erasing) and *ithbāt* (confirmation) in the two Divine records 176
Badā' is justifiable from the Qur'ān only in the same manner that the prohibition of ṣalāh may be proven from the verse: "Do not approach ṣalāh..." 177
Divine knowledge is pre-eternal, immutable and all encompassing 178
Badā' ascribes compound ignorance to Allah 179
Badā' gives all entities in existence a degree of superiority over Allah 179
The entire world is the divine record of erasing and confirmation 180
An example to explain erasure and confirmation 180
Amazing explanation of "*For every term is a decree*" 181
The Umm al-Kitāb explained through an example 181
Badā' is untenable since there is no erasure in Allah's knowledge 182
Another example to explain the Umm al-Kitāb, erasure and confirmation 182
If we accept that *maḥw wa ithbāt* refers to the erasure and confirmation in *ahkām* (laws), then too this is a sign of intelligence, and in no way does it constitute badā' 183
If you have understood this, then in the same light understand the system of the creation of Allāh. 183
Understand the *maḥw wa ithbāt* as the various different prescriptions and medications. 184
The third proof presented by the Shī'ah in support of the concept of badā' 184
Answer 1 185
First example 186
Second example 186
Answer 2 187
Dispelling a doubt 187
Answer 3 189

Conclusion: Badā' constitutes speaking lies 190
Badā' in the ʿilm of Allah does not arise due to the misunderstanding of the listener 191
Two other explanations of this verse and the complete uprooting of the badā' dogma 192
Conclusion on the discussion of badā' 194
Discussion on the Imāms possessing knowledge of *ʿilm al-ghayb* (knowledge of the unseen) 195
By accepting that the Imāms have knowledge of the past and future, one has to accept that they equal Allah in knowledge 195
An exceptional point 196
Hypothetically, if we prove that the A'immah possessed complete knowledge of the past and future, the fear of badā' still remains 198
The virtues of the Khulafā' and the Ṣaḥābah in the words of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the other A'immah 199
The virtues of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq 200
The discrepancies of ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī which were unsuccessful 201
The bravery of al-Ṣiddīq and his steadfastness 202
Platform of praise is one of exposure and not one of ambiguity 203
The merits of ʿUmar in the words of ʿAlī 204

Chapter five **207**
The belief of taqiyyah **207**
Taqiyyah in light of Shīʿah narration 208
Control of death, knowledge of the unseen, untold bravery; why the need for taqiyyah then? 208
ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ recited a eulogy for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after his demise, when there was no fear for his life 209
Sometimes a bitter answer is superior than pearls and sugar 210
The narrations of the Shīʿah themselves refutes any possibility of taqiyyah 210
Amīr al-Mu'minīn orders one to be truthful in all circumstances 211
The bravery of the Imām and his desire for Jannah 211
The Ambiyā' are instructed to be patient, tolerant and always speak the truth 212

If taqiyyah was incumbent, then the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be a sin 212
The Imām strikes awe into ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with his miraculous feat 213
Taqiyyah in light of logic and common practice 214
Taqiyyah in light of the Qur'ān 215
Taqiyyah deprives one of Jannah 216
Losing courage out of fear for the disbelievers is prohibited so taqiyyah is extremely far-fetched 216
Taqiyyah is reproachable and not praiseworthy 217
The Ambiyā' only fear Allah 218
Emphasis on propagation 218
The purpose of the Ambiyā' and their deputies is to warn and convey glad-tidings 219
The purpose of risālat is propagation 220
Propagation of dīn is compulsory upon the Ambiyā' and Imāms 222
The Makkan period eliminates any possibility of taqiyyah 223
The reward and encouragement of patience 224
Migration is compulsory when practicing the truth is not possible 226
Propagating the truth is best, even when in danger 226
Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ never concealed any aspect of dīn 228
Concealing one's marital status does not equal to the concealment of dīn 229
The difference between defending yourself and taqiyyah 230
According to the Shīʿah, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ failed to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ 230
Taqiyyah was obligatory upon ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ during his reign as khalīfah 232
Assessing the allegation of resorting to taqiyyah during his reign as the khalīfah 233
ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ failed to promote dīn despite having supernatural abilities 233
Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ defended the truth all by himself 234
Proclaiming the truth and suffering the consequences has always been the hallmark of the chosen servants of Allah 235
Judging taqiyyah by social standards 236
Imām al-Bāqir curses those who refute the title of al-Ṣiddīq 237
Why was taqiyyah ḥarām for Imām al-Bāqir? 238
The curse of Imām al-Bāqir proves the legitimacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah 240
An objection against Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ by the Shīʿah themselves 241

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter 1
Response to the letter 7

Four Daughters of the Prophet ﷺ 9
The Qur'ān attests to the Prophet ﷺ having multiple daughters 9
The number of the Prophet's ﷺ daughters in light of Shīʿī references 10
No significance recorded about the other daughters 12
ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in History 13
The order of the Qur'ān to extricate Muslim women from the control of disbelievers 14

The merits of ʿUthmān, Dhū al-Nūrayn رضي الله عنه 17
ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Arabic 18
The support for ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه from the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah 20
ʿAlī رضي الله عنه defends Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه 22
ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was not displaying hypocritical behaviour 23
The effort of other Ṣaḥābah in defending ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه 23

Assessing the allegation of cowardice against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه 25
ʿAlī رضي الله عنه has control over his own life according to Shīʿah 26
ʿAlī رضي الله عنه lived in fear and humiliation all his life according to the Shīʿah 27
ʿAlī رضي الله عنه could not stand up for Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها rights 28

The Nikāḥ of Umm Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رضي الله عنها 29
ʿAmmār ʿAlī's deception 30
ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه performed her nikāḥ 31
ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه will be among those who will be on the Aʿrāf according to the Shīʿah 31
The beloved of the Prophet ﷺ in Aʿrāf whilst Jews and Christians in Paradise? 32
ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه silence reflects his approval 33
If ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is a kāfir then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is no less 34
This marriage is established from Shīʿī sources 34
The Shīʿah do not love the Ahl al-Bayt and they hate the Ṣaḥābah 35

If love of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ entitles one to Paradise then why not ties of kinship 36
ʿUmar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ children from this union 38

The Discussion Relating to the Fadak Estate 39
Love of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah 39
The two eyes of īmān 40
Honouring some of the Ahl al-Bayt and rejecting the rest 41
Who is meant by the term Ahl al-Bayt? 42
Placing the cloak around Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 43
Shīʿah have enmity for most of the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا 45
The Shīʿah love for ʿAlī is worse than hatred for him 47
The superiority of the Ambiyā' over the Imāms from Shīʿī references 48
Rejecting the testimony of Allah and their Imāms regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 49
The incident of Nabī Mūsa and Khiḍr—An eye-opener 51
Even if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr erred it would be converted to a virtuous deed otherwise he would not have secured the tributes of the Imāms 51
Repentance from sins secures entry into Paradise 52
Establishing his repentance from Shīʿī reports 53
One whose good deeds are weightier would enter paradise 53
The promises of Paradise and forgiveness for the Muhājirīn 54
Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام burning the calf was rational 56
Basing the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate on the verse regarding the rights of relatives 56
A historical assessment of the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate 57
The verse in question has no relevance to the issue of Fadak 58
The implications of their interpretation of the verse 59
Accusing the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ of oppressing his relatives 60
Khums becomes forbidden for the Banū Hāshim 61
What about the spoils of war after the demise of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا? 62
Why is the Fadak narration recorded in Sunnī references? 64
The narration is in conflict with the context of the Qur'ān 64
The address is specific but the implication is general 67
The verse from Sūrah al-Rūm 68
Misinterpreting the words "their rights 69

What about the share of the destitute and the traveller? 70
If this is a Madanī verse it is governed by the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl 71

ʿAmmār ʿAlī—evidence of forgery and fabrication 72
Six conditions for the validity and credibility of a book 73
The first condition: Factual substance 73
The second condition: Impartiality of the author 73
The third condition: Familiarity of the author 74
The fourth condition: Non-Obscurity in transmission 74
The fifth condition: Authenticity [in ḥadīth collections] 74
The sixth condition: Selecting between one of two non-reconciliatory reports 75
Distorting and tampering with references 76
The meticulous preservation of the resources of the Ahl al-Sunnah 76
The credibility of the author does not necessitate the credibility of the compilation 78
A quotation from Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah 78
ʿAmmār ʿAlī ascribes some Shīʿī references to Ahl al-Sunnah scholars 80
A word about ʿAllāmah Suyūṭī's compilations 81
Rare references 81
The opinion of the Muḥaddithīn about Wāqidī 82
ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Islamic history 83

The Fadak Estate was from Fay' 84
The history of the Fadak Estate in the first period of Islam 84
The difference between Hibah and ʿAṭā' 87
A word on these baseless narrations 88
The Shīʿah take support from reports rejected by the Muḥaddithīn 89
The reference of Al-Durr al-Manthūr 90
The explanation of Dhū al-Qurbā in Jalālayn and al-Itqān 91
Sayyidunā ʿAlī's appointment over the Fadak Estate 94
The first Shīʿī explanation 94
Our response 94
The second Shīʿī explanation 97
Our response 98
The third Shīʿī explanation 99

Our response 99
The fourth Shīʿī explanation 100
Our response 100
Does the narration of Sayyidah Fāṭimah claiming Fadak was gifted to her occur in Sunnī traditions? 102
Two evidences establishing the baselessness of the report of gifting Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah 103
The greatest treachery of the Shīʿah under the guise of Taqiyyah 106
Lisān al-Mīzān exposes some of these fraudsters 107
One step lower 109
The gifting of Fadak is not established even if their narration is considered authentic 110
The fact that ʿAṭā' denotes gifting and borrowing as established from a popular Ḥadīth 112
A failed attempt to establish that Aʿṭā' denotes Hibah 115
Criticism against Sayyidunā Zayd 116
Taking the apparent literal meaning into consideration 118
Debating from an Akhbārī stance 119
The condition of the narration of Mishkāt 120
Fadak was overseen by the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life 121
If Fadak was inheritance, then one person's possession of it should be regarded as oppression to the remaining heirs 121
Evidence about the beneficiary assuming control being a prerequisite from Shīʿī references 122
The Ḥadīth reports of both sides 123
Witnesses and Testimony — a Response 125
Sayyidah Fāṭimah would comply more with the requirements 126
The Narration of Minhāj al-Kirāmah 128

False allegation against Sayyidunā ʿUmar 129
Reasons why Sayyidunā Abū Bakr gave Sayyidunā Jābir wealth without testimony 130
The fact that seeking witnesses from Sayyidah Fāṭimah can also be seen as an attempt to favour him 131
Failure to satisfy the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir could have been seen as a

failure on the part of the Prophet ﷺ 131
Dubious fanaticism 135
ʿAlī and Umm Ayman versus Allah and ʿAlī 137
A possible ijtihādī error 138
If an infallible Imām can be under the sway of Shayṭān then Abū Bakr is excused as he is not infallible 139
The Ḥadīth about the estate of the Ambiyā' 140
No contradiction between Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth reported by Abū Bakr 142
The Shīʿī objection to this Ḥadīth 143
Response 144
Evidence that the Prophet ﷺ is exempt from the Address in "Allah Instructs You Concerning Your Children." 147
Other examples of the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion 148

A second dimension of conformity between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth 151
Yūsīkum Allāh is qualified by another verse 154
Fay' — not sole ownership 157
Another interpretation 158
A third interpretation 159
The trouble with giving the Lām multiple connotations 160
Reasons why the Prophet's ﷺ possessions cannot be inherited 161
Dispelling the misconception 162
What Does the Lām Denote Then? 163
Objection from the Shīʿah 164

Fay' is actually Waqf — not personal ownership 166
Difference between Ṣadaqāt and Fay' 166
Infallibility of Fāṭimah 167
Third evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay' 167
Fourth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay' 168
Fifth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay' 169
Sixth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay' 170
Seventh evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay' 171
Two difficulties in considering Dhū al-Qurbā and other recipients the owners of Fay' 172

An objection about Waqf which stems from the verse, "And those your right hand possesses" 173
Response to this objection 174
An unanswered question 175
Movables Such as Food and Crops Cannot Be Classified as Waqf 176
Conveyances and clothing cannot be considered Waqf items 177
Deliberation of Ṣāḥibayn's stance regarding Waqf of movables 177
The stance of Ṣāḥibayn helps our cause too 178
Waqf of movable items is of no benefit to the poor 178
Some immovable items give long term recurring benefit 179
A linguistic discussion on "Those your right hand possesses" 179
The nature of the Prophet's ﷺ portion from the fay' 180
The categories of recipients are formulated on the basis of poverty 181
A linguistic discussion on from what Allah has returned to you 182
Determining the meaning of fay' 183
Continued misunderstanding of the Qur'ān by the Prophet ﷺ is an impossibility 183
The verse, And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger, is a Mukhaṣṣiṣ of the verse, Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all) 184
The Fadak Estate is not included in Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all) 184
True contradiction of the sources by the Shīʿah 185
Explicit direction is worthy of following, whilst actions have the possibility of a distinct standalone law 186
Even if the narration, "We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from," is not acceptable, it has no bearing on the Fadak Estate 188

Determining the Nature of the Inheritance of the Ambiyā' 191
The inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام 194
The context of this verse 195
Inheritance also refers to a successor 198
Inheritance denoting assuming control and possession of something 199
Majāz Mutaʿāraf 200
The narration of Al-Kulaynī 201
The supplication in Sūrah Maryam—a supplication for a successor (not necessarily a son) 203

The Ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr—stronger than Tawātur 205
Multiple transmissions of this Ḥadīth 206
Evidence from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 208
No contradiction between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth 210
Shī'ī reports in substantiation 213
Personal effects 213
The second Ḥadīth of al-Kulaynī 215
The share of other shareholders 216
The Ahl al-Bayt and the possessions of the Prophet ﷺ 217

Fāṭimah and ʿIlm al-Ghayb 219
An example of the Shī'ah keeping a divine law a secret 224
Did Abū Bakr return the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah 226
The Narration of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim 229
ʿAlī undertaking sole management proves the endowments ineligible for inheritance 231
ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما attest to the honesty of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه 232
The superlatives cheat, deceiver and, transgressor was hyperbole—a figure of speech 233
Double standards 236
Intricate questions and answers—a dilemma 238
Two Objections 239
Answering the second objection 240
The first answer 240
The second answer 240
The third answer 241
An objection to the three answers 242
Answering the first objection 242
Why then the friction between them and Abū Bakr? 245
Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها refused to speak to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما not attend her funeral 246
The entire ummah is dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the Qur'ān 246
The Prophet ﷺ is excluded from the verse, And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little 248

Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is dependent on the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in understanding the Qur'ān 248
Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا not speaking to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ explained 250
The first explanation 250
The second explanation 250
Was Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا angry with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? 251
Discussing the preposition of Wajadat 251
Searching for credible interpretation of the pious and entertaining good thoughts regarding them 252
Assuming Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 252
If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ made a mistake, the Shīʿah say he repented—discussing the narration of Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn 253
Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is pleased according to the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah 258
Barring Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from attending her burial 259
Her bequest was general 259
Her funeral prayer was performed by Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 261
Nobody's displeasure matters when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are pleased. 263
ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ angering Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on numerous occasions 265
Sending a proposal was no sin and anger was a human reaction 266

A summary of the answers to the objections of Fadak 269

Transliteration key

ء، أ، إ - ’
آ - ā
ب - b
ت - t
ث - th
ج - j
ح - ḥ
خ - kh
د - d
ذ - dh
ر - r
ز - z
س - s
ش - sh
ص - ṣ
ض - ḍ
ط - ṭ
ظ - ẓ
ع - ʿ
غ - gh
ف - f
ق - q
ك - k
ل - l
م - m
ن - n
و - w, ū
ه - h
ي - y, ī

بِسۡمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحۡمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

Ḥujjat al-Islam Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī

One of the most esteemed personalities in the History of Islam

By Muftī Saʿīd Aḥmad Pālanpūrī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ

Name and lineage

His name was Muḥammad Qāsim. His historic name was Khurshīd Ḥusayn. His father's name was Asʿad ʿAlī and his grandfather's name was Shaykh Ghulām Shāh. His entire lineage is as follows:

> Muḥammad Qāsim — the son of Asʿad ʿAlī — the son of Ghulām Shāh — the son of Muḥammad Bakhsh — the son of ʿAlā' al-Dīn — the son of Muḥammad Fattāḥ — the son of Muḥammad Muftī — the son of ʿAbd al-Samīʿ — the son of Mawlānā Muḥammad Hāshim.

His lineage links up to Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Birth and demise

He was born in 1248 A.H (1832) in the town of Nanawta. He passed away on Thursday 4 Jumādā al-ūlā 1297 A.H (1879) after Ẓuhr Ṣalāh. *To Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return.*

Hometown

His hometown was Nanawta, which is a populated town. It is situated twelve miles east of Deoband, fifteen miles south of Saharanpur, nine miles west of Ghangoh, and seven miles north of Delhi.

His ancestral grandfather, Mawlānā Muḥammad Hāshim رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, was very close to the Mughal Emperor Shāh Jaḥān. Mawlānā Muḥammad Ḥāshim رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ settled in Nanawta and in so doing transformed it into an Islamic town. It was in this town that his progeny flourished and it was from this very town that the radiant star, Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, shone forth.

Childhood

During his childhood, he saw a dream which his grandfather interpreted to mean that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ will grant him abundant knowledge and he will become a well-

known personality. His intelligence, prowess, courage, quick thinking, broad mindedness, and diligence stood out from his childhood days and he was always first in his class. He had an affinity for poetry from an early age and would write some of his stories in rhyming verse.

Education

His primary education began in the Madrasah of Nanawta. He then studied Arabic under Mawlānā Muhtāb ʿAlī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in Deoband. Impressed by Mawlānā's wisdom and deep insight, Mawlānā Muhtāb ʿAlī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ gave him the title of "*ʿilm kī Bakri*" (goat of knowledge), a reflection of his constant pursuit of knowledge. He then studied for a short while under Mawlānā Muḥammad Nawāz in Saharanpur. He then went to Delhi in the company of Mawlānā Mamlūk ʿAlī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in 1259 A.H, where he began studying *Kāfiyyah* (an intricate book on Arabic grammar) and completed his studies in five years. He studied ḥadīth under Mawlānā Shāh ʿAbd al-Ghanī Mujadidī1 رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. After arriving in Delhi, he began excelling at such a rapid pace that none could keep up with him; he could read intricate books of philosophy just as a ḥāfiẓ can recite a portion of the Qur'ān.

While residing in Delhi, he also sought spiritual reform from Mawlānā Ḥājī Imdād Allāh al-Thānwī al-Makkī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and began his efforts of self-purification.

Personality and character

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had made Mawlānā an awe-inspiring personality because of which many people lacked the courage to address him, even though he was a light-hearted person with exceptional character. He preferred to be alone and from an early age and would prefer remaining silent. This is another reason why people would think twice before engaging in a conversation with him. He was extremely generous and big-hearted, who took pleasure in entertaining guests and acts of hospitality. His wife was the same as he was, and even more so, such that she was the one who inspired his generosity. He would say, "My generosity is the result of Aḥmad's mother (i.e. his wife)."

---

1 Mawlānā Shah ʿAbd al-Ghanī Mujadidī — the son of Abū Saʿīd — the son of ʿAzīz al-Qadr — the son of Safiyy al-Qadr — the son of Muḥammad ʿĪsā — the son of Sayf al-Dīn — the son of Muḥammad Maʿsūm — the son of Aḥmad (Mujadid Alf-e Thānī). He is the author of Inhāj al-Ḥājah fī Hāl Sunan ibn Mājah. He was born in Delhi (1235 A.H) and passed away in Madīnah (1296 A.H).

Dislike for status

His condition for many years was such that if any person addressed him as "Molwī" then he would not reply, but if he was addressed by his name then he would be pleased. He disliked being praised and was uncomfortable with it. He was informal with everyone and kept a relationship more of friendship than as a teacher with his students. He disliked being referred to as 'Mawlānā' and would say, "This title has spoilt everything, if there had not been a necessity, I would have remained hidden, such that no one would have known of my existence."

Glad tidings

During his days as a student, he saw a dream that he was standing on the Kaʿbah and thousands of rivers were flowing from it. His teacher, Mawlānā Mamlūk ʿAlī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ interpreted this to mean: "Knowledge will spread from you abundantly."

On one occasion, his mother complained to Mawlānā Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ about his unemployment and lack of income, on which Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ laughed and said:

> This man is about to become such that he will have hundreds of attendants. He will attain such fame that his name will be known across the world. You complain of poverty when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is going to grant him a thousand-fold more, such that he will be better than those who are employed.

His mother lived to see this prediction come true.

Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ also said about him:

> People of his calibre used to be found in the early years of Islam, now for years to come, we will not see another.

Life history

After completing his studies, he took on the responsibility of editing at the Aḥmadī publications company in Delhi. During this time, Mawlānā Aḥmad ʿAlī Sahāranpūrī (who added the footnotes to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*) tasked Mawlānā with adding the footnotes to the last five or six chapters of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, which he fulfilled to perfection, each footnote taken from reliable books and nothing from his own opinion.

Later Jihād was declared against the British but due to difficulties faced at that time, the Muslims were not victorious. As soon as the British had gained complete control of the country, they issued a warrant for his arrest. He remained hidden for a few days and then departed for Ḥajj and by the time he returned an official pardon had been announced.

After returning from Ḥajj, he began acting as editor for Munshī Mumtāz ʿAlī in Meerut, while at the same time teaching. It was during this time that the foundation for Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband was laid. After a little while, he went to Deoband and saw to every aspect of the Madrassah. He taught all the books with no reservation and would render such a commentary that none had ever heard nor seen. He expounded amazing facts in each subject; reconciling differences of opinion and explaining each law in detail. The effects of his teachings remain to this day.

He performed his first Ḥajj in 1277 A.H and during the journey, in the month of Ramaḍān, he memorised the entire Qur'ān and recited it in Tarāwīḥ ṣalāh. He performed his second Ḥajj in 1285 A.H and the third in 1294 A.H. Upon return from this Ḥajj his illness began, which proved to be fatal.

Children

He had two sons: Mawlānā Muḥammad Aḥmad رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (former principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband) and Muḥammad Ḥāshim رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He also had three daughters.

Students

He had numerous students but the most famous are:

1. Shaykh al-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd Ḥasan Deobandī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He studied the majority of his books in Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband and studied ḥadīth under Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. The first graduation ceremony of the Dār al-ʿUlūm was held for him.

2. Mawlānā Fakhr al-Ḥasan Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, who added the footnotes to *Sunān Abū Dāwūd*. His personality was exactly the same as Mawlānā Ashraf ʿAlī al-Thānwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and was a very capable scholar too at that. He also acquired his knowledge from Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.

3. Mawlānā Aḥmad Ḥasan Amrawhawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ had great affection for him and he also loved Mawlānā dearly. He was very intelligent and a proficient scholar.[1]

Aside from these three illustrious personalities, Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ had many more students; however, the sacrifices and services of his other disciples and students have not been recorded, even though he treated them all equally.2

Accomplishments

The accomplishments for which he is most famous are three:

1. Establishing Islamic Insitutions, more so Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.
2. Calling for Jihād against the British.
3. Services to Islamic knowledge.

We will now highlight his achievements in each of these fields.

Establishing Islamic Institutes

In 1274 A.H (1857) when the British had taken control of the entire country and the Mughal dynasty came to an end, Islam and Muslims became a target, and it was the Muslims who suffered the pain of the piercing claws of the British most. The reason for this is that the dynamic of the relationship between the Muslims and the British was that of conqueror and conquered, usurper and usurped, victory and defeat.

Those ʿUlamā' who were rendering services to dīn during the rule of the Mughal dynasty, did so either receiving a wage or assistance from the royal court and as such lived in relative ease. A few ʿUlamā' also rendered services in their own private capacity; teaching, tutoring and lecturing in their own localities. However, after the British took over, there no longer remained any assistance from the government in the form of wages or financial assistance. Poverty and impoverishment created an entirely new challenge and slowly the traces of the glory of Islam began to

---

1 They are known as *Ḥasanayn-e Thalāthah*, i.e the three Ḥasans.

2 This was all taken from *Sawāniḥ-e ʿUmrī* by Mawlānā Muḥammad Yāqūb Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, who was among the first teachers of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.

dwindle, as the ʿUlamā' now became occupied with their own livelihood. What was to happen to the future of Islam? This was a vital question.

However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى says in the Noble Qur'ān:

وَالَّذِيْنَ جَاهَدُوْا فِيْنَا لَنَهْدِيَنَّهُمْ سُبُلَنَا ۚ

And those who strive for Us, We will surely guide them to Our ways.[1]

Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى inspired all the saints at the same time with the idea that the only way of protecting dīn and Islam is to now establish Institutes using public funds. This meant that those ʿUlamā' who until this point in time were rendering services to dīn in their own private capacity will now have to join together and work collectively. One of the benefits of this would be that the Institute would see to their basic needs and as a result they would be able to serve dīn with no worry of having to earn a livelihood. Another benefit of this would be that if any scholar, out of necessity or for any other reason, were to abandon his responsibilities then another would take his place. The garden would continue being watered even if the gardener were to change. "Public funds" is general and not from a particular person and as such work would continue whilst relying upon the funds of the general public. They would not depend upon the wealth or donations of the government, wealthy, or those in authority which meant the Institute would suffer no harm if a select few refused to assist the Institute; as the loss suffered on account of them would be borne by another. In addition, the general public who will assist the Institute will not try to influence it in any way. If funds are taken from a particular individual then the life and death of the Institute is dependent upon that very one person. Another harm of this is that true reliance in Allah will not be gained, as opposed to when a person has no one else to rely upon except Allah. The third most harmful aspect of relying upon the funds of a particular individual is that he will have the ability to influence policy and what is taught in the Institute.

On account of this inspiration, ʿUlamā' began opening Institutes across India but there still remained a few who did not understand this inspiration or the true reality of it. Thus, they continued their efforts of dīn on their own and just as a roof cannot stand without a pillar, their services too did not last very long and slowly

1 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 69.

they became preoccupied with earning a living and their services to dīn came to an end. A few of them did indeed build Institutes but disliked asking from the general public and so remained dependent upon specific individuals or the government. As a result, these Institutes either had to close due to lack of finance or inevitably became government institutions.

It is a great favour of Allah that not only did these ʿUlamā' understand the meaning of this inspiration but also understood its importance and true reality. It is without a doubt that Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ understood its importance more than all and in fact wrote it out for us, which is preserved to this day. He wrote:

> The principles on which this Institute (Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband) and others like it will operate.

This makes it clear that these principles are not only stipulated for Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband but for every Institute relying on public funds. Let us examine numbers 6, 7, and 8 of these principles.

> 6) As long as this madrassah will not have any fixed income then, Allah willing, it will be run with attention turned towards Allah. If it will attain a fixed income, such as rental, trade, or government grants then the attention will be turned away from Allah and reliance upon Allah will fade. In this way divine assistance will stop, infighting will begin, and we will find ourselves becoming dependent.
>
> 7) Assistance from the government and influential people is harmful.
>
> 8) There is more blessing in the funds attained from the general public, who do not seek any favour in return. In essence it is the general public whose intentions are nobler.

These principles should be read over and over again and pondered over deeply; one will then see how true this inspiration was. Nevertheless, as a result of this inspiration the ʿUlamā' began to establish Institutes based upon these principles and now almost a century later, we are forced to admit that if they had not done so then Islam would have faded into non-existence in India.

Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ used his influence to establish the building of various Institutes and in his short life managed to build four.

1. Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband
2. Madrassah Qāsimiyyah Shāhī Murādabād
3. Madrassah Manbaʾ al-ʿUlūm Galāwatī
4. Madrassah Jāmiʿ Masjid Amrawhah

All of these Institutes were founded by Mawlānā but it is the good fortune of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband that Mawlānā became its supervisor and maintained it, as Deoband was his second hometown. All the illustrious personalities from Deoband such as Mawlānā Ḥājī ʿĀbid Ḥusayn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (first principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband), Mawlānā Rafīʿ al-Dīn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (second principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband), etc., all had a close relationship with Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. After 1857, Deoband became his true home town, which had already been predestined, and he took up permanent residence in Deoband and saw to all the needs and requirements of the Dār al-ʿUlūm. The other Institutes founded by Mawlānā did not receive the same favour and as a result could not reach the same level as Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband. Today this Madrassah has grown into a huge firm tree providing fruit to the entire world.

Calling for Jihād

In the latter half of the nineteenth century a time of difficulty began for all Muslims in India when it became a battleground for the British. The rule of the Mughal Empire ended and the Muslims were now faced with many threats, both internal and external. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent such individuals who fought these threats and succeeded in keeping the pillars of dīn standing. Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ is the leader of this group of illustrious individuals. Just as he began the establishment of Islamic Institutes so too did he begin fighting all external and internal threats. When the British decided to take control of India by force of the sword, Mawlānā fought them back at Shāmilī. When the British began attacking all religions in India, specifically the dīn of Islam, it was Mawlānā who combated them, earning the gratitude of not only the Muslims but the Hindus as well. In the fair of Chāndāpūr (in the district of Shāh Jahānpūr) the Hindus were singing his praises. They too acknowledged Mawlānā's intelligence, prowess, and ability to debate, and would flock to gather around him from afar, as the threats posed by the British affected all Indians.

The British then changed their game plan and tried to attack the Muslims from the rear, preparing a small group of Hindus to oppose the Muslims and Islam. Mawlānā fought back this threat head on as well.

The British then adopted a new plan, establishing schools appearing to teach Islam but in actual fact were enforcing British teaching. This was a cunning plan and a well-placed web, but Mawlānā saw its true nature and saved the Muslims from its snares.

The British then thought of another plan and created a small group from among the Muslims to oppose the majority. Mawlānā thwarted their plans in this as well. In essence, Mawlānā fought whatever plot the British could devise, setting the standard for all future ʿUlamā' that it is compulsory upon them to fight against all forms of mischief and threats to Islam.

Services to Islam in the field of knowledge

With the arrival of western education in India, Mawlānā saw the change in the mindset of the people; people were no longer satisfied with narration alone but wished to know the wisdom and secret behind each law. This is why Mawlānā began substantiating each law of dīn and his books comprise more of logical reasoning than narration. This change in the mindset of the people was first perceived by Mawlānā Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Delhwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (1114 A.H-1174 A.H), which is the reason for his authorship of his famous book, *Ḥujjat Allāh al-Bālighah*, in which he presented the wisdoms behind each tenet of dīn.

After Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, it was Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ who rendered services in this direction. The services of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ differed from that of Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in three aspects:

1. Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ did not debate matters pertaining to belief separately, whereas Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ discussed it as a separate subject explaining its law and principles. This is one of the great achievements of his life.

2. Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ would explain the wisdom behind the laws of dīn in general or only regarding specific acts mentioned in ḥadīth and not each and every act, whereas Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ explained the wisdom

behind even the most minute of acts and at times also highlighted the wisdom behind what the Fuqahā' describe as *Khilāf al-Qiyās* (acts contrary to reasoning) proving them to be in accordance with reason after all. However, it is unfortunate that more could not be done in this line but whatever has been, serves as a guide and proof for us. The senior scholars who came later took this effort further. *Al-Masāliḥ al-ʿAqaliyyah li Aḥkām al-Naqlīyyah* of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ as well as of other scholars is worth reading in this regard.

3. The substantiations of Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ were based more upon reasoning and logic whereas Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was able to make even the most intricate and purely logical reasoning perceivable. This was unique to his literary works which cannot be found anywhere else.

The same can be said for both Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ that their knowledge was more inspired than derived only from books. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had granted both of them a great share of inspired knowledge.

Whatever the case, Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ wrote a number of books to guide this Ummah, which can be divided into three categories:

A. Easy

B. Difficult

C. Intricate

Easy books

1. ***Qiblah Numā:*** This is in Urdu, which explains that the Kaʿbah is not an object of worship but the direction one faces during worship. Only the first quarter is easy.

2. ***Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah:*** This is in Urdu, which debates matters of difference with the Shīʿah. This is the easiest of all his books.

3. ***Tuḥfah Laḥmiyyah:*** This is in Urdu, which explains that consumption of meat is the natural inclination of man. This was jointly written by Mawlānā and one of his close friends.

4. ***Ajwibah Arbaʿīn:*** This is in Urdu and in two volumes. It provides answers to forty questions posed by the Shīʿah. The first volume was jointly written by Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ and Mawlānā ʿAbd Allāh Anbīṭawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ. The second volume was written by Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ alone.

5. ***Fuyūḍ-e Qāsimiyyah:*** This is in Urdu and Fārsi. This book discusses various topics. The discussion on Jumuʿah in villages was translated and published separately under the title: *Laws of Jumuʿah*, which is why we have not mentioned it as a separate book.

6. ***Wāqiʿah Mehlah Khudā Shanāsi:*** This is in Urdu. It is a discussion of the truth of dīn which took place in his first debate in Shāh Jahānpūr 1293 A.H. Munshi Muḥammad Ḥāshim, owner of Ḥāshimī publications and Mawlānā Muḥammad Ḥayāt, owner of Ḍhiyā'ī publications, printed and published this jointly. The entire debate of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ has been related in it.

7. ***Mubāḥathah Shāh Jahānpūr:*** This is in Urdu and also discusses the truth of dīn and a refutation of Christianity. This is the second debate that took place in Shāh Jahānpūr in 1295 A.H. It was compiled by Mawlānā Fakhr al-Ḥasan Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ and Shaykh al-Hind رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ.

8. ***Laṭāif-e Qāsimiyyah:*** This is in Fārsi. It discusses various topics and is a compilation of nine treatises, the last of which is regarding Jumūʿah in villages. Also, in this book is *Al-Ḥaqq al-Ṣarīḥ fi Ithbāt al-Tarāwīḥ* which comprises of the treatise of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ and Mawlānā Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ. This is why *Al-Haqq al-Ṣarīḥ* has not been mentioned separately.

9. ***Taṣfiyyah al-ʿAqā'id:*** This is in Urdu and debates the principles and beliefs of dīn. It is a reply to the letter of Sir Sayyid.

10. ***Intiṣār al-Islam:*** This is in Urdu. It is a reply to ten objections raised against Islam's teachings. The *Majlis Maʿārif al-Qur'ān* edition surpasses all previous editions.

11. ***Ḥujjat al-Islām:*** This is in Urdu and discusses matters pertaining to dīn and belief, and is a must-read for every Muslim. The *Majlis Maʿārif al-Qur'ān* edition surpasses all previous editions.

12. ***Qasā'id-e Qāsimī:*** This is in Urdu, Fārsi and Arabic. It is a collection of poetic renditions on various topics.

13. ***Makātīb-e Qāsimī:*** This is in Fārsi and is a compilation of the letters written by Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

14. ***Al-Ajwibah al-Kāmilah fi Aswilah al-Khāmilah:*** This is in Urdu and is a reply to five baseless objections by a Shīʿah.

15. ***Hāshiyyah al-Bukhārī:*** This is in Arabic. The sub-notes of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* written by Mawlānā Aḥmad ʿAlī Sahāranpūrī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, which is generally found in all copies of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; the final five chapters were written by Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

All of these books were easy, even though the subject matter extremely weighty. The method of elucidation was not just simple but extremely so, such that any person is able to derive benefit from it.

Difficult books

16. ***Maṣābīḥ al-Tarāwīḥ:*** This is in Fārsi and the subject matter is apparent from the title. In addition, other amazing and intricate facts have also been discussed relating to the topic. This book was translated by Mawlānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad Deobandī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, which has been published under the name *Anwār al-Maṣābīḥ*. However, this book has not been analysed as it should have been and work still remains to be done on it.

17. ***Taqrīr Dil Pazīr:*** This is in Urdu and debates many issues. It was not completed and comprises of only what was written.

18. ***Barāḥīn-e Qāsimiyyah:*** This is in Urdu and debates several issues pertaining to dīn and belief. It was jointly written by Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and his student, Mawlānā ʿAbd al-ʿAlī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

19. ***Taḥdhīr al-Nās min Inkār Athar Ibn ʿAbbās:*** This is in Urdu. ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ states that there are seven earths and on each earth Ambiyā' were sent. This book is a detailed discussion of this report. In addition, a detailed discussion on the finality of Nubuwwah was also included. This book became extremely popular and widely accepted during Mawlānā's رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ

lifetime. Many individuals raised objections to this book and their objections were replied to by Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ himself.

20. ***Jawābāt Maʿdhūrāt al-ʿAshar:*** This is in Urdu. This comprises of ten objections raised by Mawlānā ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ on the book *Taḥdhīr al-Nās min Inkāri Athar Ibn ʿAbbās* and the replies given to it by Mawlānā. These objections were not raised in refutation but rather in search of knowledge, such that Mawlānā ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ later agreed with the opinions of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ after hearing his replies. In addition, Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Badāyunī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ also objected to this book and published a refutation of it under the name, *Fasīḥ al-Dīn Badāyunī*. Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ replied to this book. The original as well a copy of it can be found in the library of Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Ghanī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. Another copy of it can be found in the personal library of Mawlānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyab رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ.

Another person, who most probably resided in Rampur, also raised objection to *Taḥdhīr al-Nās*. Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ also replied to his objections and a written copy of this can be found in Palāwaddah. The student of Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ—Mawlānā Aḥmad Ḥasan Amrohawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ—also wrote a reply to his objections. A written copy of it can also be found in Palāwaddah. It was this very book which Aḥmad Raḍhā Khan Barelwī misquoted and misinterpreted, in his propaganda against Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. However, as the saying goes:

Whoever tries to blow out the flame ignited by Allah,

Will burn his beard but the flame will not be extinguished.

21. ***Asrār-e Qur'ānī:*** This is in Fārsi and is a substantiated reply to all questions relating to the Qur'ān. The commentary of *Muʿawadhatayn*, (Sūrah al-Falaq and Sūrah al-Nās) is also included in this book.

22. ***Intibāḥ al-Mu'minīn:*** This is in Fārsi. This is a commentary of a ḥadīth reported in *al-Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* (under the chapter of the virtues of the ʿAsharah Mubasharah in the third section), narrated by ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding the Khulafā' of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

23. ***Jamāl-e Qāsimī:*** This is in Urdu and discusses the aspects of *Simāʿa al-Mawtā*, *Waḥdat al-Wujūd* and *Ḥayāt al-Nabī*. This is a compilation of two books.

24. ***Tawthīq al-Kalām fī al-Inṣāt Khalf al-Imām:*** Also called *Al-Dalīl al-Muḥkam fī al-Inṣāt Khalf al-Imām* and is in Urdu. It discusses the reason why one following the imām should not recite Qirāʿah behind the imām. Both names refer to the same book but in *Tawthīq* there are a few additional lines.

25. ***Makātīb-e Qāsim al-ʿUlūm:*** This is in four volumes comprising of eleven letters, ten of which are Mawlānā Nānawtawī's رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ: A discussion on Fadak, a commentary on *ḥadīth al-ʿUmmā*, a discussion on what has been slaughtered in the name of others besides Allah, the *ʿiṣmah* (infallibility) of the Ambiyā', a solution to aḥādīth that seem to contradict each other regarding a *Mukātab*[1], a reply to a letter by the Ahl al-Ḥadīth ʿĀlim, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Batālawī, a reply to those who deny Nubuwwah and the miracles of the Ambiyā', the ruling regarding taking of interest in India and the income received from a land left in trust, the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and a discussion on the issue of *Imāmah*, and a reply to the substantiation of Al-Ṭusī and a commentary of the two aḥādīth. The eleventh is a commentary on the ḥadīth, "He who does not recognise the imām of his time".

    All these are in Fārsi. The letters, one to seven, have been translated by Mawlānā Qārī Ṭayyab رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ, which have been published in the twelfth volume of *Al-Qāsim*. It has been presently edited and simplified by Professor Anwār al-Ḥasan Sherkotī, now Pakistani, and published under the title of *Anwār al-Nujūm*. Unfortunately, I have not been able to read this as yet.[2]

26. ***Al-Haẓ al-Maqsūm min Qāsim al-ʿUlūm:*** This is in Arabic and is a discussion on *Al-Juz al-ladhī lā Yatajazzī* and a research into poetic rendition and music. It comprises of two letters of Mawlānā Rahīm Allāh Bijawnwarī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ, a student of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ, written in eloquent Arabic. It concludes with mention of two miraculous feats of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ.

These were the difficult books of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ and how true was the statement of Mawlānā Qārī Ṭayyib رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ regarding them:

---

1 Mukātab: A slave with whom an agreement has been reached upon dispensation of a fixed sum in exchange for his freedom.

2 This was at the time that the book was written but now I have managed to obtain and read it. The author has made a splendid effort but this book has not been solved as yet and an intricate book such as this cannot be understood by mere translation. Thus, much work still remains to be done in this regard.

> The wisdom of these books is like a huge and fertile country, which contain all the necessities of life, having no shortage of provisions or treasures. It has all the required modes of transport but the road to this country is hidden and very difficult to travel. There are no signs which make traversing this road easier nor any indications through which one can perceive the fertility of the land and take benefit from it. Apart from a select few, none possess any knowledge of this country or know of the road to it. Without a doubt the wisdom and knowledge of Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ is like this country and because of the lack of signs, hints, necessary directions, footnotes, tables of contents and translations, even the general ʿUlamā' cannot benefit from it, let alone the common masses.[1]

Intricate books

27. ***Qiblah Numā:*** The Kaʿbah is not an object of worship but rather the direction faced during ṣalāh. The final three quarters of this book are extremely difficult. Mawlānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ has rendered great service to it but still it cannot be understood appropriately. Qārī Ṭayyab رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ has also written a detailed commentary on it but sadly it has been lost.

28. ***Makātīb-e Qāsim al-ʿUlūm:*** The letter which contains the commentary of *Ḥadīth al-ʿUmmā* is extremely difficult.

29. ***Āb Ḥayāt:*** This is in Urdu and proves that the Ambiyā' are alive in their graves. This is understood to be the most difficult of all Mawlānā's books. Even though Mawlānā Yaʿqūb Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ had a portion of it removed, as he was of the opinion that none would be able to understand it (these extracted portions of *Āb Ḥayāt* are in Pilāwaddah), there still remains a dire need for a commentary to be written on it. Perhaps Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will grant me the ability to fulfil this service.

These are the books wherein the wisdom of Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ glimmers like pearls. Mawlānā Qārī Ṭayyib رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ writes in praise of this wisdom:

> The introduction to his books comes naturally such that the most important points glare one in the face. Every discussion is substantiated and well-laid out such that it appeals to the mind and its intricacies easily understood. In

1 The introduction of *Anwār al-Maṣābīḥ*, page 15, 16

> addition, Mawlānā's step by step method of explanation removes all doubts and misgivings in a clear and manifest manner such that thousands of other similar aspects are resolved, even if it is related to a different chapter. All these aspects are solved by his systematic approach and, in fact, many doors of knowledge and understanding are opened to the heart. A person is forced to accept that this aspect of Sharīʿah is so logical and within reason that it seems as if that is the only natural conclusion.
>
> In the words of Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaʿqūb رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (first head teacher of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband):
>
> Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ had a philosophical mind, which is why such deep concepts came naturally to him and as a result when discussing various laws of Sharīʿah, he would do so from a philosophical point of view, resulting in not only that one aspect being resolved but thousand others like it. In so doing, the wisdom of his philosophical view became apparent.
>
> Nevertheless, bringing various laws of Sharīʿah under one logical principle and extracting intricate laws from this principle or to gather various aspects and laws of Sharīʿah and extract one principle that governs them all, was unique to the knowledge of Mawlānā رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.[1]

What is even more astonishing is that generally logic and reasoning relates to the derivation of laws and not ḥadīth. It can be said that this law is logical or within reason but it is very difficult to say the same regarding a ḥadīth; that it is within reason and logic dictates that this be the ruling. However, according to Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ even the narrations in ḥadīth were not beyond reason and logic. His deep insight saw the logic and reason within narration just as he saw the logic and reason within the various laws of dīn. For example, according to Mawlānā the Kaʿbah being situated where it is today, it being the first House of Allah, the building of al-Masjid al-Aqsā forty years after the Kaʿbah, even the distance between the Kaʿbah and al-Masjid al-Aqsā, which is approximately two hundred and fifty or three hundred miles, all fall within logical reasoning and are not mere historic facts or coincidences. The details of this can all be read in his book *Qiblah Numā*.[2]

---

1 *Hikmat-e Qāsimī* page 20-22.

2 *Hikmat-e Qāsimī*, pg. 22, 23.

Foreword

In the name of Allah, Most gracious, Most Merciful

We praise Allah and send peace and blessings upon His noble messenger Muḥammad رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ.

The book before you is entitled *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah*. In reality there is no necessity to write anything further about it, which might even perhaps be disrespectful, as it is the written work of Ḥujjat al-Islam, the mentor of ʿUlamā, Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, the founder and rector of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband, whose name alone is sufficient certification for the veracity of this book.

In essence, this book is a detailed reply to a letter of a Shīʿī scholar by the name of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who posed a few questions regarding the issue of khilāfah and Fadak, which prompted Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ to pen a detailed treatise on the topic, substantiating the standpoint of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah.

This book reveals the deep knowledge with which Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ was inspired with. This book was written in the year 1284 A.H and various editions have since been published, gaining worldwide acceptance, but these editions did not contain paragraphs or any sub-chapters, which made benefitting from this book extremely strenuous. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ reward Mawlānā Muḥammad Aslam رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, who took the liberty of separating the content into paragraphs under various sub-chapters, which then made it possible to list the contents of the book in an index. This increased the benefit of the book tenfold. Mawlānā, to the best of his abilities, has also endeavoured not to change the actual wording of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ in any way.

Mawlānā has also translated the Arabic text, making it easier for those only acquainted with the Urdu language to benefit from this book.[1]

Only sub-chapters were added and the actual content is absolutely unchanged. This new edition was printed by the publishing house of Mawlānā Muḥammad Aslam

1 The original book was written in the Urdu language and the translation of verses of the Qur'ān and other Arabic passages were accompanied without any translation. This service was rendered by Mawlānā Aslam, may Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ reward him abundantly for his services.

رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, *Maktabah Haqqāniyyah*, roughly in the year 1962 and has now been reprinted by Nuʿmānī Kutub Khānah in Lahore.

We ask Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ to accept this effort.
Āmīn.

Bashīr Aḥmad
Principal of Nuʿmānī Kutub Khānah
Lahore

15 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1397 A.H
27 November 1977

Introduction

All praise belongs to Allah, peace and salutations upon the leader of the Ambiyā', upon his progeny and all his Companions.

I express my immense gratitude to Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى, whose grace and mercy has awarded an unworthy student such as myself the opportunity to revive this scholarly legacy. I had been thinking of publishing this work for some time but my efforts were limited to thoughts only, as I did not have a copy of this book in my possession and it was virtually impossible to obtain, as if it did not exist. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى made it such that a knowledgeable friend arrived at my door one day, placing before me a stack of books, which required binding urgently. As I went through the stack, to my delight, the book I so desired was amongst them as well. At that time, I only undertook the task of re-binding the books and he left; it was only after much persuasion that he agreed to leave the book in my possession. The task was a great one, requiring much dedication, whereas all I possessed was weakness. The book remained in my possession for some time and all I did was ponder over the daunting task that lay ahead of me. During this time a much larger publishing house intended to print it and even took the book from me, but they too returned it after sometime, with the excuse of preoccupation.

As soon as I got the book, it left my possession again and then again was returned to me, which made it clear that no further stalling could be tolerated and work should begin immediately. However, once I began reading the book, I realised how truly difficult my task was, as the book was continuous with no paragraphs, chapters, sub-chapters or even headings, as was the practice of the earlier scholars. This method was also apt for that era as they were conscientious, hard-working, book-worms, and true appreciators of knowledge, who were satiated by reading and research.

However, now such exertion is rare and no pleasure is derived from scholarly or spiritual research. Instead, to a great extent, false narrations and fables are relied upon. It was now necessary to present this knowledge in an appealing and easy to read manner, so that those who desire knowledge will not experience any difficulty. I found a person to carry out this task for me, edit and place the content into chapters; but I am forced to, ashamedly, say that whatever service he rendered

he did so without even perusing the book and relied upon his own understanding of the subject. This was yet another hurdle, which could only be overcome by undertaking to accomplish this task myself. I then formulated the chapters myself; a few chapters based upon the core content and a few additional sub-chapters. Yet the content could not be entirely presented in the table of contents as the calibre and depth of the book is such that in every two lines, a new point, new discussion and new sub-chapter can be found. It is obvious that all of these could not possibly be listed under separate chapters; thus, the complete content of the book could not be listed in the index.

The book itself has its own unique distinction, as if it is restless on account of its addressees not accepting the truth or agitated as to why the author cannot transmit the truth directly into their hearts. Despite the great depth of knowledge it contains, it has been simplified to such an extent that the most intricate discussions have been made easy to understand. It is as if it holds one's hand and leads him through each discussion, with each discussion flowing easily into the next. In spite of the deep insight and astounding level of knowledge that is expounded, the humility with which it is presented is evident, with no claims of superiority or demeaning remarks made. Worthy of note is the respect and reverence that is awarded to the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt in every chapter, which is sorely lacking in today's era.

If I were to list the unique features of this book then I would firstly have to say that its greatest characteristic is that it is the work of the founder of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband. This is not an empty expression of loyalty but an undeniable fact, as the superiority and eminence of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ was acknowledged by all and still is.

The second unique feature of this book is that both angles were taken into consideration when substantiating. In other words, in addition to the proof of narration or recorded text, logical reasoning was also cited. In fact, many matters were explained in terms of common understanding and reasoning.

The third unique feature is the explanation of verses in favour of the noble Ṣaḥābah, which is to a great extent inspired knowledge. The meaning and implication of words that are explained is utterly astonishing and the best books of tafsīr too have not reached this level.

The fourth unique feature is the scholarly investigation and analysis of certain verses and ahādīth, which the other party use to substantiated their claims. The truly remarkable aspect of this is that after the elaboration of the author, one is astonished as to how it was ever possible for them to have perceived this to be a proof for their claims, whereas in actual fact it proves our standpoint. The wisdom which is expounded is truly remarkable, clearly not self-attained but awarded by Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى.

The fifth unique feature is the comprehensiveness of each discussion, which covers a range of aspects and is extremely valuable. The words of Mawlānā Yusuf Binorī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ are indeed true:

> *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah* is more explanatory than *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*.

The sixth unique feature is the simple and uncomplicated manner of this book, which is apparent when compared to the other literary works of Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. The majority of the book is in simple spoken language but in some cases (a very few in fact), due to the scholarly nature of the discussion, a little difficulty might be experienced. The reason for this is obvious and in such pure academic discussions such difficulty is experienced by all.

Finally, I wish to add that an ardent effort was made to maintain consistency between the book and the sub-chapters and compliment the high-level of knowledge found in the book, but who are we and where is this book and its excellence? Our intention was only to inform the reader of the contents of the book, which with the grace of Allah, we were able to do.

In conclusion, I wish to end with the eulogy of Sir Sayyid, which he wrote in tribute to Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ.

Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī in the eyes of Sir Sayyid

On the demise of Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, Sir Sayyid wrote a eulogy in *ʿAlīgharh Institute Gazette* (24 April 1880). The words with which Sir Sayyid expressed his regard for Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, in addition to being free from any form of contemporary rivalry, is an open acknowledgement of the excellence, knowledge, piety, and Taqwā of Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. It goes without saying that this eulogy is free from any form of blind allegiance. When a person praises his

contemporary in such words, especially when he severely opposes the beliefs, views and ideologies of the latter, then it is most certainly worthy of note. The regard that they had for each other can only be understood from the booklet, *Taṣfīyyat al-ʿAqā'id*, which comprises of the correspondences between these two personalities. In this booklet, Sir Sayyid writes to a friend of his (Munshī Muḥammad ʿĀrif):

> If Jānab Molwī Muḥammad Qāsim ṣahib were to attend then it will be my good fortune and I will regard his flattery to be an honour.[1]

In reply to this letter, Mawlānā Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ wrote to the same friend of Sir Sayyid:

> Yes, there is no doubt that the courage and concern of the rumoured Sayyid (Sir Sayyid) is acknowledged by the people of Islam and if on account of this one were to love him then it would be fitting but on account of hearing of his incorrect beliefs, I am apprehensive and displeased with him.[2]

After having read this, now examine the eulogy of Sir Sayyid:

> It is sad that the esteemed sir (Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ) has passed away on 15 April 1880 in Deoband on account of asthma. Time itself has wept for him and will continue to do so in the future as well; but to weep for such a person, after whom no successor can be seen, is a cause of severe grief and pain. There was a time when amongst the ʿUlamā' there were such personalities who were well-known for their knowledge, excellence, piety, and Taqwā. They were unmatched as far as their simplicity, austerity, and purity of heart were concerned. People thought that after the death of Mawlānā Muḥammad Isḥāq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ no person would be born capable of equalling him but Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī—through his untainted piety, religiousness, Taqwā, and austerity—proved that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ had indeed created a person equal to Mawlānā Muḥammad Isḥāq and in some aspects even surpassed him. There are many people who saw Mawlānā Nānawtawī seeking knowledge at a very young age. He studied all books under Mawlānā Mamlūk ʿAlī and the signs of Taqwā, piety, purity of heart, and obedience to Allah stood out very early, and the following poem is most apt in describing him:
>
> *He surpassed all brilliance in intelligence and reached beyond the furthest star.*

1 *Tasfiyyat al-ʿAqā'id*, pg. 3

2 *Tasfiyyat al-ʿAqā'id*, pg. 6.

Just as he was known for his intelligence, aptitude and deep understanding during his student days, so was he known for the excellence of his character, piety, and worship of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. His time spent in the company of Mawlānā Muzaffar Ḥusayn Khāndhlāwī made him an ardent follower of the Sunnah and the company of Ḥājjī Imdād Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ blessed him with a spiritually illuminated heart. He was himself strict in adhering to the Sharīʿah and Sunnah and also strove to make others adhere to the laws of Sharīʿah and the Sunnah. He was also extremely concerned about the condition of the general Muslims. It was through his efforts that an extremely beneficial institution of Islamic learning was established in Deoband and a most beautiful masjid built. In addition to this, through his efforts other institutions were also erected. He had no desire to become a spiritual guide or shaykh but thousands of Muslims in India, especially in the southern and western provinces, regard him as such.

A few were angry at him on account of differences of opinion and he too was angry with them but to the best of my knowledge there was no action of Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, even his anger at a person or pleasure at another, that can be said to be based upon his personal ambition or enmity. Every action of his, regardless of how many they may be, was solely for the pleasure of Allah and in seeking the reward of the hereafter. He followed that which he thought to be the truth and true. His anger at a person was only for Allah and his pleasure with a person was also only for Allah. He did not regard any person as good or bad on account of his relationship with him but would only think a person such if he would perpetrate or say something that was incorrect. He would regard that person as evil on account of Allah. Loving for the pleasure of Allah and hating for the pleasure of Allah was his trait. His habits were angelic in nature and I loved him from my heart, and without a doubt a person who spent his life with such virtue is deserving of love.

All people of this age, even those with whom he had a difference of opinion, acknowledge that Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was unmatched. His knowledge in this era is perhaps slightly less than Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Muhaddith Delhwī, perhaps even exceeding him in other aspects. In simplicity, austerity and piety if he has not surpassed Mawlānā Muḥammad Isḥāq then he has definitely equalled him. He was without a doubt similar to an angel with saintly attributes and to be deprived of such a person is definitely a cause of grief and pain for those forced to live without him.

It is sad that our people instead of honouring him through practice only do so with words of praise and admiration. It does not befit our people to merely voice a few words of grief or lament for a while when such a personality is lifted from our midst or shed a few tears and then wipe them away, instead it is incumbent upon them to continue the legacy of such a personality and engrave it in the hearts of the nation.

بِسۡمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحۡمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah

All praise belongs to Allah, Rabb of the entire universe, the Most Gracious, Most merciful, Master of the Day of Judgement. Peace and salutations upon His messenger, our master Muḥammad ﷺ, the nabī of *raḥmah* (mercy), upon his progeny, wives, Ahl al-Bayt, and all his companions.

After reciting praise upon Allah and sending salutations upon the Prophet ﷺ; this unworthy and insignificant one, by the name of Muḥammad Qāsim, wishes to present before you these few pages. At the end of Rajab 1283 A.H, the esteemed scholar, pride of the ʿulamā, guide of the ummah, possessor of all meritorious qualities both inner and outer, Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ghangohī forwarded a letter to me written by a Shīʿī scholar by the name of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. The letter consisted of a number of Shīʿī fabrications. The purpose of sending this letter to me was so that I could reply to these fabrications and forward it to Mawlānā. On the suggestion of a few friends, a few of whom have family ties to me, I had already begun to use my free time to pen logical proofs for the beliefs of Tawḥīd and Risālat. This is one reason for my delay in beginning this work and another reason was my own inability and shortcomings. My own unworthiness and constant daily preoccupations resulted in my heart and mind becoming more strained. In essence, this was a difficult task but I was unable to refuse an order from Mawlānā; thus, I postponed my writing on Tawḥīd and Risālat, and finally began writing a reply to this letter a few days after it had arrived. Due to a number of reasons, such as my own weakness, lack of resources, and time, I was unable to complete this reply in one sitting but after writing on a few different occasions, I finally completed on Safar 1284 A.H. After completion I entitled these pages *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah* (A gift for the Shīʿah).

Reason for the title

The reason for this title, even though the book is in favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah and should therefore more aptly be entitled *Hadiyyat Ahl al-Sunnah* (A gift for the Ahl al-Sunnah), is that it is of more benefit for the Shīʿah than it is for the Ahl al-Sunnah. In favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it will either benefit those of weak faith by granting them conviction or those with conviction by granting

them contentment, whereas in the case of the Shīʿah; if they are fair-minded, it will grant them īmān. The reason for this is that in these pages, three sources have been substantiated from: The Noble Qur'ān, Ḥadīth from the books of the Shīʿah, and lastly clear logical proofs, all of which are accepted by the Shīʿah.

It is possible that one might object on account of my anonymity that every person substantiates whatever he desires, so how do we know that you truly understand the method of substantiation? The reply to this is simply that this treatise is before you, do not take my word for it but read it for yourself. The person who wrote it might not be perfect but what he has written in absolutely correct. Through the blessings of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah, I have complete conviction that the contents herein will prove to be beneficial. If anyone were to still object, then it should be said to him:

Sometimes even an immature child can hit the target with his arrow.

This is absolutely true, who does not know the reality of himself. In essence whatever is said about me will be correct but the claim of this treatise being the truth is not incorrect. Allah willing, this will be understood by studying this treatise.

Surely if a foolish bigot keeps repeating the same objection then this is to be expected, as this is what prejudiced bigots do. However, if an intelligent person were to act in the same manner then I still object, as replying to a book or letter means that you have refuted every substantiation of the letter, as I have done with the letter of ʿAmmār ʿAlī (which will become evident shortly), and not simply object to one or two aspects. The reality is such that every person may faulter in one or two matters, after all we are but human and I the lowest of them all. I am neither a God nor a Messenger, who is free from all error. I do not deny the possibility of having erred or forgotten, so the authenticity and reliability of the book should be gauged by the majority.

In short, if any intelligent person wishes to reply to my book then he should follow in the footsteps of this unworthy one and refute every substantiation of every discourse. At the least adhere to the rules of debate and object to the proof of every claim that was made. Proving three or four aspects to be incorrect will not suffice, as I too admit that I am not above error or mistake. So, there should be no astonishment if you were to come across a few errors. I have high hopes from the

fair-minded that they will not raise any objections to this book but would rather appreciate my effort.

Perceived disrespect

If you happen to see any text that might be seemingly disrespectful towards the Ambiyā', Ahl al-Bayt, or Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ then this humble author is not to blame for it, as such an approach was adopted from time to time as a retaliatory reply against the Shīʿah and the consequences thereof will hang on their shoulders. It was they who forced our hand and Allah is my witness that I am free from any such beliefs and regard loving these saints as good fortune, and possessing a positive attitude towards them a means of salvation in the hereafter. I am hopeful that Allah will accept my excuse on account of the circumstances under which I was forced to make these statements.

Quoting narrations

If in quoting Shīʿah narrations I have shown some hesitancy at times then too it is allowed for a few reasons:

1. Who has the books of the Shīʿah in their possession? What benefit would there be in a Sunnī gathering all Shīʿī books?

2. The Shīʿah in accordance with the saying, "People of the house know better of the condition of the house," will be acquainted with the immorality their works contain but where is a Sunnī to find all these critical, degrading, contemptuous, and obscure narrations, as they are nowhere to be found in his books.

3. In accordance with the saying, "A person scrutinises others based upon his scrutiny of himself," the false perception of the Shīʿah has not allowed them to trust the Sunnī, so we wholly understand why the Shīʿah consider the Sunnī to be on falsehood.

Hence on account of the above, especially the first point, if a Shīʿah were to still object then it is on him.

Reliance upon *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*

On account of the saying:

الصدق ينجى و الكذب يهلك

Honesty leads to salvation and falsehood to destruction.

This honest one admits that he did not have any Shīʿī sources to refer to except *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* and when I had *Tuḥfah* then those of knowledge know that I had everything, in accordance with the poem:

It is sufficient to console me; just one glance at you.

As well as:

None of the books do I have but *Tuḥfah* is all of them.

The reason for this is that the book is the masterpiece of the renowned Sunnī Muhaddith, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Delhwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, whose immense knowledge and research is acknowledged by Shīʿī ʿUlamā' as well, even if they do not verbally admit it. So, I have relied upon those narrations of the Shīʿah that are reported in *Tuḥfah*, either in its primary text or sub-notes, which is considered to be no less than a reference to their primary source books by the scholars. This is the reason why this unworthy one cited references from it without any second thought.

A sincere council

I advise the fair-minded from amongst the Shīʿah to not disregard the intelligence and aptitude of the author of *Tuḥfah* on account of my lack of resources but check the references with your own books. The majority of the references that are cited are well-known relied upon works of the Shīʿah, there are no references to books that are impossible to find or never heard of. If you find the reference to be correct then you will have to accept it. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ has himself said:

مَنْ يُضْلِلِ اللّٰهُ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ

Whoever Allah sends astray, there is no guide for him.[1]

1 Sūrah al-A'raf: 186.

So, what are the chances of this happening when in the words of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ they are unable to find that which is able to make them understand? Where is the word of Allah and where is the word of the unworthy one?

Furthermore, the truth is only there for acceptance; if one accepts the truth then what harm is there? Nonetheless do not be lethargic in checking the reference, if any discrepancy is found then it is my responsibility.

However, I know full-well that the Shīʿah are aware of this without me mentioning it, who is not aware of the fact that according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, falsehood—especially in matters of dīn—is strictly prohibited and a heinous sin. We are not of the same ilk as the Shīʿī scholar ʿAmmār ʿAlī who portrays himself to be a sparkling gem but he deceivingly passes fabrications and incorrect narrations to be authentic and weak to be reliable. It is a fallacious lie to invent a source for something that is purely fiction. The deception that was perpetrated by ʿAmmār ʿAlī in his letter will become clear as one proceeds further with this treatise.

We were under the impression that the falsehood of the Shīʿah had ended with the scholars of the past but, unfortunately, their successors have continued the legacy. Claiming that the narrations of the garden of Fadak being gifted to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is reported in the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah and claiming that the beloved daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (Zaynab, Ruqayyah, and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُنَّ) were not his offspring are the actions of the leader of the Shīʿī ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who follows in the footsteps of his deceiving Shīʿī mentors.

If one desires to lie then lie in such a way that is believable and can be accepted by people but I have never seen such a fabrication, simply because a person intended to become Sunnī, that neither was Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ or the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ given any consideration nor even the innocent Imāms. It can still be said regarding the failure to mention the nikāḥ of Umm Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to the second khalīfah ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, even though difficult, that failing to mention it is not a denial of it having occurred, but claiming that Sayyidah Ruqayyah and her sisters رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُنَّ were not the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and that the narration of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ giving Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا can be found in the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah is such a blatant lie that no form of interpretation can camouflage its fallaciousness. After reading this entire treatise, you will see the truth of my words, Allah willing.

An interesting angle to the deceit

On closer inspection, one cannot blame ʿAmmār ʿAlī, as at the end of the day the Ahl al-Sunnah is the correct *madhhab* (code of belief) based upon the testimony of the Qur'ān and the family of the Prophet ﷺ, whereas the madhhab of the Shīʿah is false based upon the testimony of the Qur'ān and the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Yet, despite these testimonies, he continued seeing his leaders and scholars calling the madhhab of the Ahl al-Sunnah false and the madhhab of the Shīʿah true. As a result of this he became confused, due to his sincere reliance upon his scholars, and thought that it is correct to call falsehood the truth. And why should he not when he is one of the leading scholars of the Shīʿah himself?

While reciting verses of the Qur'ān, the following verse of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb inadvertently escaped my lips:

وَاللّٰهُ لَا يَسْتَحْيِيْ مِنَ الْحَقِّ

But Allah is not shy of the truth.[1]

Since ʿAmmār ʿAlī, according to his own claims, desires only to obey Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, he should ensure that he abstains from all falsehood when relaying his opinions. Instead, he has opted to act contrary to the character of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and blacken his face with falsehood, following in the footsteps of his predecessors (which he regards to be meritorious whereas they were cursed by the illustrious Imāms and labelled as liars after being deeply grieved by their deceit) and drawing the burden of deceit upon his back, so that in following them he too can earn the curses of the Imāms if he cannot earn their supplications.

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 53.

Chapter one

The Ahl al-Sunnah are in conformity with the Qur'ān

The beliefs and teachings of the Ahl al-Sunnah are in conformity with the *Thaqalayn* (i.e. the Qur'ān and Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ) whereas the beliefs and teachings of the Shīʿah faith opposes the Qur'ān and Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ. The number of statements which the Imāms made disparaging and demeaning the scholars of the Shīʿah are such that it is impossible to list them all in this concise treatise but as a way of example a few will have to be mentioned, which will be easily understood by the level-headed. After discussing these examples, we will continue with refuting the letter (of the Shīʿī scholar ʿAmmār ʿAlī). Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ mentions in the first chapter of the Qur'ān:

الَّذِيْنَ أَتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَتْلُوْنَهُ حَقَّ تِلَاوَتِهِ أُولٰئِكَ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِهِ ۚ وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهِ فَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُوْنَ

Those to whom We have given the Book recite it with its true recital. They [are the ones who] believe in it. And whoever disbelieves in it - it is they who are the losers.[1]

After studying the implication of this verse there is no possibility for any person to ever doubt the Ahl al-Sunnah being on the truth, and once he has no doubt then he has attained the first stage of conviction that the Shīʿah are on falsehood.

The implication of the verse

To elaborate upon the assertion made above, this verse was revealed regarding a few of the Ahl al-Kitāb and even though revealed regarding them, it has made īmān dependent on having faith in the Book of Allah: "Recite it as it should be recited, they are the ones who believe in it." When this is the prerequisite for īmān, we learn that the sign of īmān is that one recites it abundantly, whichever Book of Allah it might be: Tawrāh, Injīl, or Qur'ān. An example of this is if an intelligent person understands something properly and quickly, and another then remarks: "This can only be understood by the intelligent." Even though this praise was specifically for that person, in reality it will also be praise for every other intelligent person who understands that point in the same manner. Thus, this quality (even though it was

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 121

directed to the Ahl al-Kitāb will testify to the īmān of all those who possess it and it) can only be found in the Ahl al-Sunnah and none of the other sects of Islam. The recitation of the Shīʿah is something well-known to all.

The Shīʿah deprivation of reciting the Qur'ān

In fact, their recitation of the Qur'ān is so well-known that they have become parables of failing to learn the Qur'ān. This can only mean that they are unable to recite the Qur'ān as it should be recited and they have failed to make that effort upon the Book of Allah which is required. As far as the Ahl al-Sunnah are concerned and reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited; what need be said, their repeated recitation is such that chapters are memorised.

This verse also suggests that amongst the various sects of Islam, the sect on the truth will be the one which memorizes the Qur'ān and the others will be unable to do so because if they were able to then it would necessitate them also being included in this praise despite them being on falsehood. Nevertheless, this bounty has been granted to the Ahl al-Sunnah and all of the other sects have been deprived of it, such that up to this day you have never heard of any other sect having memorised the Qur'ān, whether they be Khawārij or Shīʿah (I mention these two only because there are no other sects in India but them). After the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shīʿah are more in number such that there is rarely a village or town where they cannot be found. Not to mention Lucknow, suburbs of Dakan, and the districts of Sindh; where in addition to being the majority, authority is also in their hands. Thousands of Shīʿah ʿUlamā' reside therein and it is from here that the Shīʿah dogma has spread throughout India, yet you will not find a single ḥāfiẓ amongst them. If any of them happened to have been accused of being a ḥāfiẓ by the Shīʿah then he replies that he had memorised it but his memory has gotten a little weak and he cannot recite at the moment. If he does recite then he recites one or two chapters, unable to recite the entire Qur'ān, beginning to end.

Amongst the acclaimed *ḥuffāẓ* (plural of ḥāfiẓ) of the Shīʿah is Jaʿfar ʿAlī, the senior imām of Delhi, whose piety, taqwā, knowledge, and excellence, if failing him to earn the title of Mujtahid al-Zamān (Mujtahid of the era) most definitely earns him the title of a Mujtahid. What was the level of his recitation of the Qur'ān before his illness? I have witnessed this with my very own eyes, along with the other attendees of the Shīʿah faith, when he would recite in the qirā'ah gatherings of

Nawāb Ḥāmid ʿAlī Khan; he would recite while gazing into the Qur'ān and then too he erred twice. Now see the manner in which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ reveals the truth: in the same gathering there were ḥuffāẓ of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who were forced by the Shīʿah to also recite the Qur'ān and when they did, they recited from memory. Yet the Shīʿah still fail to take lesson.

Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, a Sunnī who resides in Najībabād, informed me that he used to study a few books under Jaʿfar ʿAlī. One day it just so happened that the book mentioned: "The Shīʿah cannot memorise the Qur'ān." On hearing this Jaʿfar ʿAlī asked him whether he would listen to him recite. Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz replied:

> What difficulty is there in reciting it in two sittings or perhaps if asked to recite as much as you can in one gathering.

However, Jaʿfar ʿAlī replied:

> Can we not rather arrange for one *juz'* (chapter) to be recited daily?

It should be borne in mind that some gifted individuals are able to memorise an entire juz' of the Qur'ān in one day from scratch. What kind of a ḥāfiẓ is there who has not recited the entire Qur'ān in one sitting? And I know that Jaʿfar ʿAlī is unable to recite even one juz' in one sitting. This was but an empty promise. Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz thought that this was a ruse and that he would memorise the chapters to be recited each day, which would prove my claim to be false or perhaps he might have memorised a few chapters, which he will recite and then escape from reciting the rest with some flimsy excuse or the other.

It should be noted by all that he did not memorise the Qur'ān and to award him the title of ḥāfiẓ is absolutely incorrect. If by chance one or two have memorised the Qur'ān then the Shīʿah ought to be ashamed of this too, as it is common knowledge that in the cities and villages of the Ahl al-Sunnah hundreds of ḥuffāẓ can be found. At times the number of Ahl al-Sunnah residing in a village is the same as the Shīʿah yet amongst the Shīʿah you will not find even a single ḥāfiẓ whereas in the same village amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah countless ḥuffāẓ can be found. In areas such as Sahāranpūr, Pānipat and Karānah this is the state of affairs. The reason for this failure to memorise the Qur'ān (whereas the Shīʿah often boastfully claim that never mind the Qur'ān, the Shīʿah memorise the entire *Tafsīr al-Kabīr* as well) is that they are not of those who recite the Qur'ān as it should be recited.

Why are the Shīʿah deprived of reciting the Qur'ān

The reason for this failure to recite the Qur'ān, and Allah knows best, could be a result of the differences in the tastes of man. Just as the preferences of man differ from one to the other as far as food and nourishment is concerned; some having a taste for sweet while others have a greater inclination to bitter foods and that which is relished by some might be abhorred by others. Some dislike the smell of perfumes and spicy pickles with the mere smell of it let alone giving them a headache, might render them ill. Worms on the other hand revel in the sight of faeces and other filth, whereas the smell of perfume does not attract them. In a similar manner, tastes and preferences differ with regards to the nourishment of the soul. Likes and dislikes vary, what brings pleasure to one causes discomfort to the other and to the Shīʿah any effort upon the Noble Qur'ān is tantamount to death for them.

Or perhaps the reason for this deprivation is that whichever student is disrespectful towards his teacher, it is the practice of Allah that such a student will be deprived of knowledge. The reason for this is perhaps that just as gratitude leads to an increase in bounty:

لَئِنْ شَكَرْتُمْ لَأَزِيْدَنَّكُمْ

If you are grateful, I will surely increase you [in favor].[1]

Ingratitude leads to the bounty being rescinded. In addition to this The Prophet ﷺ has said:

من لم يشكر الناس لم يشكر الله

> Whoever does not express his gratitude towards people has not expressed his gratitude to Allah.[2]

The bounty of knowledge is attained through the intermediary of a teacher and the teachers of the greatest bounty, the Noble Qur'ān, were none other than the illustrious Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, amongst whom Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه were the compilers of the Qur'ān. Why then should a person not be

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 7.

2 *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: 1955.

deprived of the knowledge of the Qur'ān on account of him showing disrespect towards them?

True īmān is found in those who recite the Qur'ān appropriately

Just as the point above becomes apparent from the verse recited, so too do we learn that true īmān is reserved for those people who recite the Qur'ān in abundance as it should be recited. Those who are deficient in their recital of the Noble Qur'ān or practice upon it according to their own personal understanding or even those who adhere to its teachings but recite it little — or not at all — are not included. The reason for this restriction in favour of those who recite the Qur'ān as it should be, is primarily because whoever will read a book repeatedly will understand it best and he will understand its true reality. Īmān in the book of Allah means that one considers its laws and directives to be the truth. Whoever will follow its directives will not be deprived of true īmān and will not be included amongst the sect referred to by the words:

وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهٖ فَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُوْنَ

And whoever disbelieves in it - it is they who are the losers.[1]

Undoubtedly those who are deficient in their recitation and do not adhere to its teachings or intend to practice upon it according to their own interpretations; such people are often deluded by the laws of the British, which contains no subtleties, so what will they understand of the Qur'ān which is a treasury of all knowledge and filled with subtleties? Such people who say one thing about the Qur'ān when the Qur'ān says something entirely different, they have disbelieved in the Qur'ān despite their claims of having faith in it. They are those who are referred to by the words of Allah:

وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهٖ فَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُوْنَ

And whoever disbelieves in it - it is they who are the losers.

The following verse also refers to them:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 121.

يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيْرًا

He misleads many thereby.[1]

The reason for revelation supports this deduction

Supporting this deduction, aside from it being apparent, is that this verse was revealed in favour of those who recited the Book of Allah in abundance and as a result memorised the qualities of the Prophet ﷺ that were mentioned in that Book, allowing every angle and aspect of it to become apparent to them. This resulted in them recognising the Prophet ﷺ as soon as they saw him. However, there is difference of opinion whether the Book referred to here is the Tawrāh or the Injīl and whether it refers to the Christians or the Jews.

The majority will be considered

It is apparent to those of knowledge that the entire Ahl al-Sunnah is considered to be one and the entire Shīʿah sect for that matter as well. Collectively the Ahl al-Sunnah should be considered and collectively the Shīʿah should be considered, and then it should be seen which of the two groups collectively recites the Qur'ān abundantly, as it should be recited. When scrutinising any group collectively then one ruling will apply to the entire group, if it is little then it is for all and if it is abundant then too it will apply to all. This is akin to the arms, legs and other limbs of the body, whereby the actions of one will be attributed to the entire body, i.e. the person himself. If he has some ailment in his hand, then he will say: "I have an ailment" or "A certain person has an ailment." Similarly, he says I saw, he saw, I hit, he hit, in all these cases the action of a part of the body is attributed to the person himself and not that part only. This is the rule of "Majority is equal to entirely" and is accepted by all, whereby the action or quality of the majority will be taken to be that of all. With this in mind, it is noted that the majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah recite the Qur'ān abundantly as opposed to the Shīʿah whose state of recitation is known.

The Shīʿah defence

It is possible that the Shīʿah might attempt to save face by claiming that according to them, reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited means to recite it with humility

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 26.

and veneration (*Khushūʿ* and *Khuḍūʿ*); and what proof do you have that this is found amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah but not amongst the Shīʿah? Thus, the Shīʿah too are included in the above verse.

As far as humility and veneration is concerned, we do not deny its necessity, because humility and veneration are attained either by firm belief upon the Qur'ān or abundant recitation. The manner in which firm belief will lead to deeper humility and veneration is evident and requires no further explanation. As far as abundant recitation is concerned: the majority of men are negligent of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ and more inclined to the world, in such a case a moment or two of dhikr or recitation of the Qur'ān will not remove this negligence. However, if he spends hours upon hours, over a long period of time, it will create the light of attentiveness in his heart. This is when humility and veneration is attained. However, these differences can only be understood by those who perform dhikr and recite the Qur'ān; it is uncertain whether the Shīʿah will be able to understand it.

The Ahl al-Sunnah have firm belief in the Qur'ān

In any case firm belief together with abundant recitation is a means of attaining humility and veneration upon the Qur'ān. One can only imagine the firmness of belief those who refer to the Qur'ān as being the pages of ʿUthmān (i.e. the Shīʿah) whereas the Ahl al-Sunnah regard the Qur'ān to be the exact word of Allah, without any alterations, additions or subtractions. Much can be said but the Arabic proverb will be most apt here:

الاناء يترشح بما فيه

Only that which is contained in a vessel will flow forth.

Studying the conditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah will allow us to determine which of the two have a firmer belief in the Qur'ān. The condition of the Ahl al-Sunnah is well-known: they regard the Qur'ān as a part of one's life. While the Shīʿah may keep the Qur'ān in their bags or in their homes, the Ahl al-Sunnah keep it in their hearts. This is the reason why the Ahl al-Sunnah give the greatest preference to the teaching of the Qur'ān over all else. Children are first taught to recite the Qur'ān and they are made to even memorise portions of it. Nothing overrules the Qur'ān such that even ḥadīth is only considered, if found to be in harmony with the Qur'ān. If a contradiction is found, then the blame rests upon

the shoulders of the narrators as it is evident that they have erred in some way or the other. As for the Shīʿah, their disregard for the Qur'ān is such that Al-Kulaynī reported in his book *Al-Kāfī*, (which is considered by them to be the most authentic book on ḥadīth) such narrations regarding the Qur'ān that if a person were to read them then he would discard the Qur'ān altogether.

The belief of the Shīʿah regarding the Qur'ān

According to them, the Qur'ān has been altered in the same way as the Tawrāh and Injīl were altered if not worse, such that they have replaced referring to the Qur'ān as the Word of Allah with the term "Pages of ʿUthmān" and without verbally saying it, they believe that from the *Thaqalayn* (the two weighty things which the Prophet ﷺ had left behind for the guidance of the ummah) they are unable to derive benefit from the Qur'ān. It is evident that the Qur'ān has no weight in the eyes of the Shīʿah because if this were not true then what would the meaning of Shīʿah statements such as these be:

> Reciting the Qur'ān is no less than smoking a pipe.

Nevertheless, the majority of the Shīʿah bear testimony to the fact that the Qur'ān has no worth in their eyes and amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah a few might be found, whose proclamations of honour are not complimented with their actions. As far as abundant recitation is concerned, this requires no explanation, as the Shīʿah themselves admit that this virtue belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Humility and veneration belong to the Ahl al-Sunnah as well

If the Shīʿah were to claim that humility and veneration is implied by reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited then too, we will not object as this too belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah, but what fault is it of ours that the wording of the verse implies abundant recitation? The reason being that the words "*as it should be recited*" is the *mafʿūl muṭlaq* (adverb) of the verb "Recite" and it is common knowledge that an adverb has to be from amongst the possible categories of that verb. Reciting abundantly is without a doubt of the categories of recitation but humility and veneration are not, rather they are external conditions. Recitation is an act of the tongue whereas humility and veneration are acts of the mind. It is also not correct to affix the result: "*They are the ones who believe in it*" to the statement: "*Those who were given the Book*" as the appropriateness of the sentence requires that the clause

be affixed to the mentioned form of recitation. Those acquainted with the laws of *balāghah* (eloquence of the Arabic language) understand this well. This is also why the verb, "*yu'minūn*" (believe) is in the future tense and not the past tense.

If humility and veneration is implied, then the order of occurrence will be switched

If the meaning of reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited is taken to mean reciting it with humility and veneration, then the meaning will be switched. The explanation of this is as follows: īmān either denotes the commonly implied meaning1, perfect and complete subjugation which is referred to as īmān-e kāmil, or *taṣdīq* (affirming) the intended meaning of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. In each of these cases the order of occurrence will be switched.

In the case of the commonly implied meaning, testifying that none is worthy of worship except Allah and Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is the Messenger of Allah is understood by everyone to come before humility and veneration, i.e. humility and veneration will be dependent on the level of īmān one has and not the other way around that īmān itself is dependent upon humility and veneration.

As for īmān denoting īmān-e kāmil, this too precedes humility and veneration in recitation because it (īmān) is the cause, whilst humility and veneration are the result. The verse:

الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَتَطْمَئِنُّ قُلُوْبُهُمْ بِذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ ۗ اَلَا بِذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ تَطْمَئِنُّ الْقُلُوْبُ

Those who have believed and whose hearts are assured by the remembrance of Allah. Unquestionably, by the remembrance of Allah hearts are assured.[2]

Also suggests that īmān-e kāmil is the cause of abundant dhikr and the contentment of hearts, as contentment of the heart cannot be attained without *Nafs-e Muṭma'innah*, which is itself a result of īmān-e kāmil, which is manifest.

All that remains, is īmān denoting taṣdīq, which is clarified by the verse:

---

1 Belief that Allah alone is worthy of worship and Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is the Messenger of Allah.

2 Sūrah al-Rʿad: 28.

وَإِذَا سَمِعُوْا مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَى الرَّسُوْلِ تَرَىٰ أَعْيُنَهُمْ تَفِيْضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ مِمَّا عَرَفُوْا مِنَ الْحَقِّ ۖ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا اٰمَنَّا فَاكْتُبْنَا مَعَ الشَّاهِدِيْنَ

And when they hear what has been revealed to the Messenger, you see their eyes overflowing with tears because of what they have recognized of the truth. They say, "Our Lord, we have believed, so register us among the witnesses.[1]

The concentration and deliberation referred to by "*You see their eyes flowing with tears*" in this verse is preceded by īmān because the meaning of this verse is that when the people mentioned above heard the revelation that had descended upon the Prophet ﷺ, you will see their eyes filled with tears on account of them having understood the truth. This makes it clear that after having heard much about the Qur'ān they requested to hear it for themselves and after hearing it, their eyes were filled with tears and their hearts filled with deliberation. It can never be that first they concentrated and cried and thereafter the truth dawned upon them. Thus, if the meaning of "*Recite it as it should be recited*" is said to mean reciting with humility and veneration (and not abundantly) then the order of occurrence will be changed (and the verse will mean that on account of humility and veneration they were blessed with īmān whereas one is blessed with humility and veneration in recitation on account of īmān).

If abundant recitation is implied, then the meaning will be correct

If "*Recite it as it should be recited*" is said to mean abundant recitation, then the meaning will be correct in all three instances. Those without īmān or possessing weak īmān through abundant recitation will understand the meaning of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ's word, resulting in them being guided, their doubts removed and granting them true faith, which is the essence of īmān.

If the commonly implied meaning of īmān is implied, then abundant recitation will also award one such īmān. If īmān-e kāmil is implied then too one will be awarded it because through abundant recitation, negligence is removed and slowly one attains the required level of attentiveness, purifying his heart even further. As for the meaning of taṣdīq of the intended purpose of Allah then this too is obvious as it is well-known to everybody that a person who reads a book more than others will have greater knowledge of that book.

---

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 83.

A doubt regarding the verse

One doubt still remains. The result, "*They are the ones who believe in it*", is clearly attached to the clause, "*Recite it as it should be recited*", for a few reasons. Firstly, because of the noun being affixed to the clause and the fact that the verb was in the future tense "*yu'minūn*" (believe) and not past tense (the verb "*āmanū*" was not used). But there is one possibility that this could be merely a sign of īmān (that one recites it abundantly) and not a result of īmān, as is the case with the signs of many things that the very sign of it is created from itself. An example of this will be smoke, which is a sign of fire but in itself is created from fire and its existence dependent upon the existence of the fire and not that the fire is dependent upon smoke. So, what is wrong if recitation with humility and veneration is said to be a sign of īmān but at the same time it is created from īmān, and in this case Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ only intended to make mention of the sign.

The reply to this will firstly be that to abandon the best interpretation and rely upon such weak interpretations is itself a sign of poor understanding.

This is more so when we are dealing with the Qur'ān, which will only have the best interpretation.

Secondly the purpose of mentioning a sign of something is to make it recognisable and distinguishable, thus if the sign is itself imperceptible and indiscernible then mentioning such a sign is futile, and the speech of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ can never be futile. Humility and veneration are inner qualities which cannot be perceived so in making this a sign of īmān, it would result in describing something vague with something also vague or something imperceptible with something also imperceptible. On the other hand, reciting the Qur'ān abundantly is something perceptible and if this is said to be a sign of īmān then it would make sense and this sign itself necessitates humility and veneration, which would make it correct for this to be just a sign, not affecting the meaning, order of occurrence, or the adverb.

Another benefit of this verse

After having discussed the possible doubt regarding the interpretation of this verse, I wish to mention another benefit which it gives. It comes to mind that the clause, "*Those to whom We have given the Book*", indicates that if any of those who were not given a Book, i.e. they deny it completely or misinterpret it after

accepting it, were to become a ḥāfiẓ then it is no problem or one can even say that they may recite similar to the manner in which it should be recited. However, as far as those who were given the Book are concerned, only those who are on the absolute truth will be granted the ability to recite it abundantly. The reason for this is that abundant recitation, which is the manner in which the Qur'ān should be recited, is a sign of īmān. Thus, it will only be seen in those who believe in it entirely and not in everyone. With this in mind, the famous tale of Burnus, the Christian, having memorised the entire Book of Allah will need not be doubted and may be accepted to be possible.

Nevertheless, we learnt from the sign of reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited that the glad tidings of "*They are the ones who believe in it*" is for the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah are described by:

وَمَن يَّكْفُرْ بِهٖ فَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُوْنَ

Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.[1]

Many verses of the Qur'ān prove the Ahl al-Sunnah are on the truth

There are numerous verses of the Qur'ān which prove the Ahl al-Sunnah are on truth and the Shīʿah on falsehood, and why should it not; when the majority of Shīʿī beliefs oppose the Qur'ān. The beliefs and practices of the Ahl al-Sunnah however, are in complete conformity with the Qur'ān. The reason for this is that through abundant recitation they have understood the intention of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ, whereas the Shīʿah on account of not fulfilling the right of the Qur'ān have been deprived of its understanding. Since this has all been proven from the verse of the Qur'ān, those with intellect will understand that the verses of the Qur'ān will oppose the religion of the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah will conform to the Qur'ān. In fact, not just a few but the majority of the Qur'ān refutes the beliefs, practices and customs of the Shīʿah and bears testimony to the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah. How is it possible to explain all of these verses in this brief treatise, especially when each of these verses refutes the Shīʿah and affirms the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

However, this one verse is capable of representing all of the other verses which is why I will suffice with it. It is possible that an obstinate Shīʿah might object to

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 121.

this verse when understanding the guidance, it contains and say: "So what if the Qur'ān contains this one verse, it is but one. What credibility does the Qur'ān have, it makes no difference if it opposes our beliefs? The words of the Qur'ān have been altered and changed, additions and subtractions carried out, so it is not far-fetched to believe that this too was added by the Ahl al-Sunnah."

If they were to make such a claim then the reply would first be that according to the research scholars of the Shīʿah either no additions or subtractions were made to the Qur'ān, as is the believe of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, or subtractions have occurred but no additions. Thus, the Qur'ān having no additions is a matter of consensus and the verse under discussion cannot be refuted. However, since both these standpoints of the Shīʿah oppose the narrations of *Al-Kāfī*, which is considered to be the most reliable book by them, and the majority of Shīʿah believe that additions and subtractions both occurred in the Qur'ān; this reply will be insufficient.

The second reply will be that this doubt itself is proof of the falsehood of the Shīʿah faith. By the testimony of the Shīʿah themselves we have learnt that the Shīʿah religion has no credibility because the first source of the laws of dīn is the Qur'ān and when they have no reliance upon it, whichever aspects of their faith they manage to somehow prove from the Qur'ān, it will not be accepted.

The foolishness of not relying on the Qur'ān

The Thaqalayn, which is accepted by both groups, bears testimony that the Qur'ān and ʿItrah will always remain for one to grasp onto in order to save one from deviation. So accordingly, if one cannot grasp onto the Qur'ān then one cannot be saved from deviation and he has been cast far astray. Thus, for the Shīʿah to present such an argument is tantamount to shooting themselves in the foot.

There is no ḥadīth in any of the sects of Islam that has reached the same level of authenticity as the Qur'ān and there is no ḥadīth regarding which the narrators are all in consensus regarding its wording as they are regarding the Qur'ān. Furthermore, when one studies the conditions of the narrators of the Shīʿah then he discovers new levels of unreliability. In summary, if any Shīʿah were to present this as a counter argument, which they do most often, then we too have much to say in return.

This proves my point

The confession of the Shīʿah themselves has proved the claim I made under the commentary of the verse, because when they have such a lack of reliance upon the Qur'ān, claiming such phenomenal changes to have been enacted in it, that the Qur'ān as we know it no longer remains the Qur'ān. So now if a Shīʿah were to memorise it or even recite it as it should be, he has not truly recited the Qur'ān or memorised it.

The practice of the Ahl al-Bayt negates any changes having occurred in the Qur'ān

All the narrations of the Shīʿah mention that the Ahl al-Bayt recited this very same Qur'ān, substantiated from it and cited its verses as proofs. They would also make commentaries on the verses of this very same Qur'ān. The commentary on the Qur'ān which has been ascribed to Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī is a commentary of the same. The Ahl al-Bayt taught this Qur'ān to others, their children and their servants and it was this same Qur'ān that they recited in their ṣalāh.

The lengths to which it has been narrated and circulated is proof of its authenticity

In addition to this, imparting this Qur'ān as it has been revealed and teaching it is compulsory upon the ummah of the Prophet ﷺ and there is consensus on this. We know for a fact that whenever any person embraced Islam in the life time of The Prophet ﷺ, he was first taught the Qur'ān after which he would then teach it to others. In this manner, thousands learnt the Qur'ān directly from The Prophet ﷺ and in some battles up to seventy ḥuffāẓ would be martyred. To this very day, even in the villages, recitation of the Qur'ān is regarded as one of the greatest acts of worship, with people remaining engaged in its recitation night and day, in ṣalāh and out. When a child enters the Madrassah, the first thing he is taught is how to recite the Qur'ān. In short, the Qur'ān is not the same as the *Al-Kāfī* of Al-Kulaynī or *Al-Tahdhīb* which was narrated through *taqīyah* (dissimulation) and hidden away for centuries in some box. The Qur'ān is available in abundance with thousands of copies easily at hand, as opposed to *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb*, for which a search needs to be carried out in order to obtain a copy. Then too, even amongst the Shīʿah, what will every Shīʿah do with a copy of *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb*,

and not everyone is capable of understanding it as well. India and Iran aside, in other countries the name of *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb* is not even known. If perchance you were to come across one or two copies, then they would be riddled with errors. The case is different with the Noble Qur'ān, it can be found in every country, city, town and village, such that no other book is available in such abundance. Every person has his own copy, with some homes having numerous copies. Such care has been taken that millions of ḥuffāẓ have memorised it and even the verses, letters, diacritical marks and dots have been counted and recorded. Does it make sense to any sane person to believe that *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb* of the Shīʿah is free from alteration, such that they regard it to be the most authentic book, whereas the Qur'ān is regarded to be tampered with and is claimed to no longer be reliable?

The wide availability of the Qur'ān clears ʿUthmān from all accusations

The era in which the Qur'ān could have been possibly altered, such is the Shīʿah accusation against ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, could have been done in one or two copies and in no way could every single copy be seized from each Muslim residing in Syria, Persia, Yemen and Ḥijāz. All these countries came under the banner of Islam and its populace regarded the Qur'ān as their means of salvation, reciting it night and day. In no way could all of these copies be seized and altered. These copies were written by ḥuffāẓ: did Uthmān alter the Qur'ān in their hearts as well, such that it resulted in only altered copies coming into circulation? Considering all of this, no sane person will ever claim that the Qur'ān has been altered. When the Qur'ān is free from any change, addition or subtraction, when the commentary of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī is of the same Qur'ān, then substantiating from the following verses will be absolutely correct:

الَّذِيْنَ أَتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَتْلُوْنَهُ حَقَّ تِلَاوَتِهِ أُولٰئِكَ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِهِ ۚ وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهِ فَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُوْنَ

Those to whom We have given the Book recite it with its true recital. They [are the ones who] believe in it. And whoever disbelieves in it - it is they who are the losers.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 121.

Certificate of authenticity from the Qur'ān itself

If this is further supported by the Qur'ān itself, then without a doubt the substantiation made will be correct and it will be compulsory to accept. When we searched through the Qur'ān, we found numerous verses testifying to the fact that the Qur'ān is as it was revealed with not a single change or variation. Its words are as they were revealed without any substitution. I think it necessary to only mention one of these verses:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

Ponder over its meaning, the emphasis laid upon its protection; it is impossible to fathom that the third khalīfah, ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, had altered it such that there remains absolutely no trace of the original Qur'ān. Despite the immense power of Allah, he still managed to thwart the power of Allah, Allah forbid.

The results of this incorrect belief

As for the assumption that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى made a promise and then broke it, this is utterly impossible. It is impossible that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would make a promise with such emphasis and then go back on His word and not protect the Qur'ān. Allah says in the Qur'ān:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُخْلِفُ الْمِيْعَادَ

Indeed, Allah does not fail in His promise.[2]

Perhaps the Shīʿah assume that the era in which ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ altered the Qur'ān or whoever did it, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was asleep or maybe forgot his promise? The reply to this was given in the Qur'ān as well, Āyah al-Kursī is recited by the Shīʿah as well, Allah says:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

2 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 9.

لَا تَأْخُذُهُ سِنَةٌ وَلَا نَوْمٌ

Neither drowsiness overtakes Him nor sleep.[1]

Allah says in Sūrah Maryam:

وَمَا كَانَ رَبُّكَ نَسِيًّا

And never is your Lord forgetful.[2]

In Sūrah Ṭāhā, Allah says:

لَّا يَضِلُّ رَبِّيْ وَلَا يَنْسَى

My Lord neither errs nor forgets.[3]

These verses remove all possibilities of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى promising to protect the Qur'ān and then failing to do so, or in error began protecting something else. When all of these are impossible, this humble servant of the house of the Prophet صَلَّىاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ wishes to ask the Shīʿah; after this firm promise and nothing to impede its fulfilment, why then did Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى not protect the Qur'ān? The only possibility then is that according to you, Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ has more power and authority than Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى (I seek Allah's protection from having to utter such statements) that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى was prevented from fulfilling his desire. This means that you have such high consideration for Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ that you consider him even superior to Allah, should you then not side with him? (Allah forbid) If this is your belief than what protection can you hope for on the Day of Qiyāmah, ʿUthmān رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ will just seize you all from beneath the ʿArsh of Allah and begin punishing you.

The falsehood of Al-Kulaynī

The only other option you have is to say that your belief is incorrect and that the narrations of Al-Kulaynī are all lies and fabrications.

عن هشام بن سالم عی ابی عبد الله ان القران الذی جاء به جبرئیل الی محمد صلی الله علیه و سلم سبعة عشر الف ایات

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 255.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 64.

3 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52.

> The Qur'ān with which Jibra'īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام came to Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم contained seventeen thousand verses.[1]

The present Qur'ān in our possession consists of approximately six thousand verses but according to this Shī'ah narration, two thirds of the Qur'ān is missing. It would have been better if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had not made any promise to protect the Qur'ān as it was on account of this promise that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم had no concern about the Qur'ān ever being altered. Perhaps if it had not been made then steps could have been taken to preserve it. Those who have studied the Tawrāh and Injīl, have not even claimed it being altered in this manner. In fact, after research it was found that the alterations in the Tawrāh and Injīl were not many, wherever they saw something supporting the claim of the Muslims they removed it and wherever there was a law causing difficulty to their leaders they would alter it, and Allah knows best the true reality. All the same, the gist of the Shī'ah ideology is that despite the promise of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to protect the Qur'ān, the Qur'ān was not preserved and it has more changes and faults in it than even the Tawrāh and Injīl, whereas these Books had no protector, neither Allah, nor a Messenger. Yes, their materialistic scholars were present, whose occupation it was to sell the verses of Allah and alter the laws of Allah. They only taught and listened to it, knew its laws and expounded it; they were never its protectors or guardians. Perhaps this is what the Shī'ah sect implies when they say the Qur'ān is worse than the Tawrāh and Injīl; that in unreliability the Shī'ah surpass the 'Ulamā' of the previous nations.

Shī'ah interpretation of the Qur'ān being safe-guarded

The scholars of the Shī'ah provide two explanations to Allah having taken responsibility of protecting the Qur'ān:

> It is protected in the *Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ* (Divine Tablet in the heavens).
>
> It is protected by the Imām in the cave, *Surra man Ra'ā*.

In the first case, the answer is obvious. Firstly, if:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Al-Kāfī*.

> *Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.*[1]

refers to the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ then how does this assist us. What is the meaning of this promise? What would benefit us is a promise to protect this Qur'ān which is in our possession, so that there will remain no doubt in deriving the laws of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ from it.

Secondly, what need is there to safeguard it in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ? Yes, if it were possible for some trouble-maker to reach the heavens than it would most definitely need safe-guarding.

Thirdly, this verse first mentions its revelation (to the world) and thereafter the promise of protection is made, the eloquence of which dictates that the promise of protection is directed towards this revealed Qur'ān and not the Qur'ān which is already safe in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ.

Fourthly, if this is truly the meaning, that it has been safeguarded in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ, then this virtue is shared by the Tawrāh and Injīl as well; what supremacy will the Qur'ān then have over the Tawrāh and Injīl? Also, why then was the promise of protection made for the Qur'ān and not for the Tawrāh and Injīl? What meaning will this have?

Fifthly, this verse refers to the Qur'ān, from its many names, by the name "Reminder" (i.e. dhikr), and did not say the words of the Qur'ān (that We have revealed the words of the Qur'ān) or "Book" (that We have revealed the Book), etc., so that there remain no room to ever consider that it has been altered, changed, added to or subtracted from.

The wisdom behind referring to the Qur'ān by the name "Reminder"

The point mentioned above requires some explanation, which makes it incumbent upon us to do so in order for the correct meaning to be understood. First one needs to understand that one item may have various names based upon its diverse uses, qualities and composition and each name will only be used in the most appropriate context and not mentioned arbitrarily. An example of this would be the manner in which one person may be a father, while at the same time he is someone's son.

---

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

Similarly, he is a brother, nephew, uncle, and a grandson. In essence one person may have different titles and each of them will not be used randomly but rather they will be used in context. A son will not address his father as son even though he is the son of another and similarly the father will not address his son as father, even though he may be a father to his own children.

A second example of this would be a governor, who may also be the treasurer and the magistrate. However, since the tasks of each of these posts are different, when he performs a task as governor then he will refer to himself as such, when carrying out a task as treasurer then he will refer to himself as the treasurer and as the magistrate when performing the duty of the magistrate.

In the same manner the Qur'ān has many names and titles, each of them on account of a different quality and different perspective. For example, the Qur'ān is called the Qur'ān because *qirā'ah* (recitation) is made of it, it is called a *Kitāb* (Book) or *Muṣḥaf* (Manuscript) on account of it being written on pages. Similarly, it is called *Dhikr* (Reminder) because it is a reminder for the ignorant, negligent and sinner. Therefore, the usage of this title, "Reminder", will only be correct when directed towards the ignorant, negligent and sinful. It is common knowledge that if any creation possesses these qualities then it is man, since the angels are free from such deficiencies. Therefore, as long as the Qur'ān was only present in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ, it was incorrect to refer to the Qur'ān by this name as there were no ignorant, negligent or sinful creation present. If any creation was present at that time, it was only the angels. However, once revelation of the Qur'ān began and it now came into the hands of man then it was correct to refer to the Qur'ān as "*Dhikr*" because the purpose of its revelation was to advise and remind the negligent. When Allah then said:

وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

We will be its guardian.[1]

The personal pronoun (its) will refer to *Dhikr* (the Reminder), which would necessitate its protection being undertaken at the time it was given this name (*Dhikr*), which is only after revelation.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

Negating the second Shīʿah interpretation

As far as the second interpretation is concerned (that the Qur'ān has been safeguarded with the alleged Imām al-Mahdī in the cave Surra man Ra'ā), firstly the entire legend of Imām al-Mahdī taking refuge in a cave is a fairy tale. When the Qur'ān has been deemed unreliable, despite the infinite number of narrators reporting it, then what reliability can be placed on a narration reported by a few deceitful individuals, especially when it is utterly illogical. No sane person will believe in such nonsense. In addition, those narrations which mention this fairy tale, do so in such a way that it makes it extremely difficult to believe that 'Imām al-Mahdī' had even memorised the Qur'ān.

This duty belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah, if you accept that Imām al-Mahdī has a similitude to the Ahl al-Sunnah, then based upon the narration:

من تشبه بقوم فهو منهم

Whoever bears a similarity to a nation is of that nation.[1]

Yes, it is possible then, that he has memorised the Qur'ān.

Imām al-Mahdī concealing the Qur'ān in this manner so that it may not fall under the gaze of the followers of the third khalīfah Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, may be considered reasonable but then we ask those of understanding as to how this is different from the first interpretation as then it will be preserved in the cave Surra man Ra'ā in the same way as it is preserved in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ. In that case, according to the fifth point mentioned above, this (Imām al-Mahdī preserving the Qur'ān in the cave as the Shīʿah believe) will not fulfil the promise of safe-guarding the Qur'ān. It will only be deemed correct to refer to the Qur'ān as a "Reminder" when the Ummah reads and teaches it. Who goes to the cave Surra man Ra'ā? Who derives benefit from it? If there is a promise to protect the Qur'ān then it is to protect this Qur'ān before us, while it is in our midst. Furthermore, if the Qur'ān of Imām al-Mahdī is in accordance with this Qur'ān then only is it the true Qur'ān otherwise the Qur'ān of the 'Imām' himself will be a forgery. In essence, ascribing such nonsense to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is an attempt to undermine the teachings of Islam.

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd:* 4031.

It is indeed foolish to believe that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ promised to protect the Qur'ān so that the ummah of Nabī Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would have no difficulty in determining the laws of Sharīʿah tomorrow and keep the flame of Islam burning until the Day of Qiyāmah but then, unfortunately, this plan was thwarted (Allah forbid). The implication of this claim that the Qur'ān is safe-guarded in the cave Surra man Ra'ā is that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ could not foresee this. Imagine what this would lead a non-Muslim to think about Islam.

This opens the doors of assault on Islam

We hope that no Shīʿah will ever mention this belief to any Jew or Christian, if they mention it to us then we would keep it silent to save ourselves from disgrace. However, if the Jews were to be the first to hear such a thing then they would be able to say that their Tawrāh has also been preserved in the Lawḥ al-Maḥfūẓ.

Apart from this, the verse of Sūrah al-Aḥqāf informs us that the Jinn had the actual Tawrāh in their possession and they did not alter it like man because then they would not have said:

قَالُوْا يَا قَوْمَنَا إِنَّا سَمِعْنَا كِتَابًا أُنْزِلَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مُوْسَىٰ مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ يَهْدِيْ إِلَى الْحَقِّ وَإِلَىٰ طَرِيْقٍ مُّسْتَقِيْمٍ

They said, "O our people, indeed we have heard a [recited] Book revealed after Moses confirming what was before it which guides to the truth and to a straight path.[1]

The conviction they had of the Qur'ān affirming what was said in the Tawrāh could have only been attained if they had the actual Tawrāh in their possession or if the Qur'ān was affirming what the forged Tawrāh contained. The second possibility (that the Qur'ān was affirming what the forged Tawrāh contained) is considered incorrect by the Shīʿah as well because the recitation the Jinn heard was directly from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not from Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or any other.

However, if they do not fear criticism of the Jews and consider a portion of the Tawrāh to still be authentic, believing only that portion has not been altered, just as the Shīʿah believe that only Sūrah al-Fātiḥah and Sūrah al-Ikhlāṣ have not been

1 Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 30.

altered, and then boastfully say that our Qur'ān is preserved in the cave, Surra man Ra'ā, where is your Tawrāh preserved, or they consider the possibility that the Jinn only heard those verses of the Qur'ān which corresponds with that portion of the Tawrāh that is authentic, and it is only on account of this correspondence that the Jinn deemed the Qur'ān to be affirming what the Tawrāh contains; then only can the Tawrāh be considered altered and the Qur'ān preserved in the cave, Surra man Ra'ā, which makes it superior to the Tawrāh. In such a case they will not have to bow their heads in shame before the Jews but still even this little form of superiority will be hard to prove.

If the Jews overlook this, the Christians will not

Even if they are victorious over the Jews in this argument, how will they face the Christians because Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام — the ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl — is alive in the heavens (both Shīʿah and Sunnī agree on this). The Imām in the cave still has to fear that the followers of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ might chance upon his hiding place and steal the Qur'ān from him or Allah forbid, even murder him. This will threaten his entire reason for concealment. Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام on the other hand is living in the fourth heaven with absolutely no worry whatsoever.

The only possibility whereby the Shīʿah will be able to retain supremacy will be by them telling the Christians that firstly it is not proven that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was a ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl (even though the same can be said regarding the Imām more so since the Injīl was revealed to Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and it would be far-fetched to then believe that he was not a ḥāfiẓ of it, as opposed to the Imām, who was not the one it was directly revealed to. In addition, memorising the Qur'ān makes him similar to the Ahl al-Sunnah whereas there is no similarity in memorising the Injīl) and secondly, we also believe that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام will descend into the world once again but when he does, his memorisation of the Injīl will be to no avail because it has been abrogated as opposed to the Imām, whose memorisation of the Qur'ān will be of use to him after he makes his appearance. The Shīʿah will finally have the actual Qur'ān in their hands after having to rely on the pages of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ all these years, centuries of supplications will finally be accepted.

However, this victory over the Christians will only be possible if the Shīʿah accept our beliefs (that the Qur'ān is unaltered) and they not only distance themselves from beliefs such as the Imāms having the authority to declare what is lawful and

what is unlawful, etc. but also entirely remove narrations such as these from their books:

> عن محمد بن سنان عن ابی جعفر قال کنت عنده فاجریت اختلاف الشیعة فقال یا محمد ان الله تعالی لم یزل متفردا بالوحدانیة ثم خلق محمدا و علیا و فاطمة و الحسن و الحسین فمکثوا الف دهرا فخلق الاشیاء و اشهدهم خلقها و اجری طاعتهم علیها و فوض امرهم الیهم یحلون ما یشاؤن و یحرمون ما یشاؤن
>
> Muḥammad bin Sinān narrates: "I was in the company of Imām al-Bāqir and I asked him about the reason for the many differences amongst the Shīʿah." He replied: "O Muḥammad! Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ was always alone until he created Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He then waited for a thousand years and then created everything else. He gathered all creation before them (these five) and made obeying them incumbent on creation and He then handed over authority of the affairs of creation to them. They make lawful whatever they desire and make unlawful whatever they desire."

According to this narration, the differences amongst the Shīʿah is on account of one of the five ruling something to be lawful and another ruling it to be unlawful, with some following one over the other. The second narration is also from Al-Kulaynī, and they need to absolve themselves from it as well.

> عن محمد بن الحسن المیثمی عن ابی عبد الله قال سمعته یقول ان الله ادب رسوله حتی قومه علی ما اراد ثم فوض الیه دینه فقال ما اتاکم الرسول فخذوه و ما نهکم عنه فانتهوا فما فوضه الله تعالی الی رسوله فقد فوضه الینا
>
> Muḥammad bin Ḥasan al-Maythamī narrates that he heard Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ say: "Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ taught his Messenger صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ etiquette until He reformed him as He so desired. He then handed over the authority of His dīn to him and said:
>
> *Whatever the Messenger grants you, hold firmly to it and whatever he prohibits you from, abstain from it.*
>
> So whatever authority was handed over to The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he handed over to us."

The first narration only mentions the authority being handed over to the five (the Prophet ﷺ, ʿAlī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم) whereas the second indicates that others also have been granted the same authority, since it refers to the same.

A baseless interpretation to a baseless narration

It is possible that some Shīʿah may claim that the handing over of authority to decree ḥalāl and ḥarām as deemed fit, described in this narration, actually refers to the usage of *ijtihād* (independent reasoning), which is considered an accepted practice by the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. So now if the Shīʿah have adopted the ijtihād of these few infallibles what is the issue?

Or they may say: Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى granted them unique abilities and aptitude, with which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى ordered them to assess matters and decree the ruling according to their understanding, so what is the problem?

However, any person of intellect will understand that this interpretation is impossible with the first narration and also it opposes the Shīʿah religion itself to accuse the Imāms of performing 'ijtihād', whereas they consider the decrees of the Imāms to be divine revelation.

As for them being granted unique understanding, we might accept this but the Shīʿah will not; let alone the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, all the sects of the Shīʿah believe that the Imāms have the authority to change the laws of Sharīʿah. If they were granted unique abilities with which to extract rulings, then what is the meaning of changing rulings. The capability should conform to their ability; extract rulings, yes, but why change rulings. Either way these interpretations have no basis.

Even if these replies were to be left aside then too this narration will have no relevance because the Qur'ān states, it is:

تِبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ

Clarification for all things[1]

This means that the Qur'ān explains everything (all laws of Sharīʿah), we might not understand it, but others do, especially the Prophet ﷺ. So, when the Qur'ān

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89.

explains everything, what need is there to hand over authority of dīn? All one can do, even the Imāms, is commentate on the Qur'ān but not say a word of your own opinion.

Handing over authority to others abrogates the Qur'ān

Our safety lies in erasing these narrations entirely, then only will we be able to save face before the Jews and Christians. If we fail to do so then they will point fingers at us saying that the Injīl might have been abrogated by the Qur'ān but not all of its laws were abrogated; many aspects pertaining to character as well as prohibitions and permissions were still maintained, and as far as beliefs are concerned then according to the word of the Muslims themselves there is no difference. The same beliefs have continued from Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to this very day. It is mentioned in Sūrah al-Mā'idah:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ

And We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad], the Book [i.e., the Qur'ān] in truth, confirming that which preceded it of the Scripture[1]

They would then say, your Qur'ān is the same as our divine book because your Imāms changed many laws as they saw fit. The first narration makes this extremely clear as Imām al-Bāqir indicated that this is the reason for the differences amongst the Shīʿah. So even if Imām al-Mahdī does have the actual Qur'ān with him it makes no difference as those laws have been changed. Instead, another Qur'ān should be made. If you fail to do so then just as you believe that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام will descend in the last era and despite being a ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl it will not avail him, on account of it being abrogated; so too it is possible that when your Imām finally emerges, intending to practice upon the laws established by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it will not avail him as it has been abrogated as well.

The laws which the Shīʿah Imām al-Mahdī will enact

As for the possibility of (the Shīʿah) Imām al-Mahdī ruling in accordance with the laws passed by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, this has been refuted by a narration reported by Muḥammad ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī on the authority of Imām Jaʿfar:

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 48.

عن ابی عبد الله انه قال ان الله تعالی اخی بین الارواح فی الازل قبل ان یخلق الاجسام بالف عام فاذا قام قائم اهل البیت ورث الاخ من الذین اخا بینهما فی الازل و لم یورث الاخ من الولادة

Imām Jaʿfar has reported to have said: "Verily Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ created bonds of brotherhood between the souls one thousand years before creating man, When the al-Qā'im (al-Mahdī) of the Ahl al-Bayt will appear, the brother with whom bonds of brotherhood was formed before creation will be the one who inherits and not one who is brother by birth."

This narration clearly indicates that Imām al-Mahdī will not act in accordance with the laws of the Qur'ān and the law that states that a blood brother inherits will be abolished. This narration also informs us that the law of a blood brother inheriting as mentioned in Sūrah al-Nisā is no addition of the khalīfah ʿUthmān رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ but is the direct order of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ because then why would its nullification be postponed until the emergence of the al-Qā'im?

In short, until the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah do not refute the belief that their Imām al-Mahdī has the authority to abrogate the laws of Sharīʿah, they will not be able to present their case of the Qur'ān being safe-guarded before the Christians as is clear from the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

Affirming the belief of Khatm-e Nubuwwah

The benefit of refuting these beliefs is not only restricted to victory over the Jews and Christians but it corrects and affirms the belief in *Khatm-e Nubuwwah* (Finality of Prophethood) mentioned in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb. If they fail to do so then the reproach upon the Jews will be directed to them as well:

أَفَتُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِبَعْضِ الْكِتَابِ وَتَكْفُرُوْنَ بِبَعْضٍ

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

So do you believe in part of the Scripture and disbelieve in part?[1]

The reason for this is that even the Ambiyā' were not allowed to abrogate laws of Sharīʿah and prescribe others of their own accord. All of the Ambiyā' of the Banī Isrā'īl, from Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ until Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, all acted upon the Tawrāh. In addition, neither Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ nor Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ were granted the authority to decree the laws of dīn as they saw fit. Whatever they decreed, they did so on the instruction of Allah. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ aside, even the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not given such authority as is stated in Sūrah al-Anʿām:

قُل لَّا أَجِدُ فِيْ مَا أُوْحِيَ إِلَيَّ مُحَرَّمًا عَلَىٰ طَاعِمٍ يَطْعَمُهُ إِلَّا أَنْ يَكُوْنَ مَيْتَةً
أَوْ دَمًا مَّسْفُوْحًا أَوْ لَحْمَ خِنْزِيْرٍ فَإِنَّهُ رِجْسٌ أَوْ فِسْقًا أُهِلَّ لِغَيْرِ اللّٰهِ بِهِ ۚ
فَمَنِ اضْطُرَّ غَيْرَ بَاغٍ وَّلَا عَادٍ فَإِنَّ رَبَّكَ غَفُوْرٌ رَّحِيْمٌ

Say, "I do not find within that which was revealed to me [anything] forbidden to one who would eat it unless it be a dead animal or blood spilled out or the flesh of swine - for indeed, it is impure - or it be [that slaughtered in] disobedience, dedicated to other than Allah. But whoever is forced [by necessity], neither desiring [it] nor transgressing [its limit], then indeed, your Lord is Forgiving and Merciful."[2]

This verse is explicit that the right to declare items ḥalāl and ḥarām has not been given to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the basis on which ḥalāl and ḥarām is declared is *waḥī* (revelation). It is mentioned in another verse:

إِنِ الْحُكْمُ إِلَّا لِلّٰهِ

Legislation is not but for Allah.[3]

Then too if we were to accept (hypothetically) that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ had indeed handed over the authority to the ummah then our Imāms are no less than theirs. It is for the propagation of these laws that Ambiyā' and Rusul were sent:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 85.

2 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 145.

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 40.

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord.[1]

In this manner one will be saved from the criticisms of the Jews and Christians, and one's own īmān will be rectified.

Ibn Bābawayh was also forced to accept the truth

Perhaps this is what Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, i.e. Ibn Bābawayh, understood and absolved himself entirely from such beliefs in his book, *Al-Iʿtiqādāt*, and according to me earned his title of Ṣadūq. However, when he did so, he attempted to absolve all of the Shīʿah as well saying:

من نسب الينا انا نقول انه اكثر من ذالك فهو كاذب

> Whoever claims that we have said that the Qur'ān contains more verses than it does, he is a liar.

He intended by this statement to prove the Ahl al-Sunnah to be liars but Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is truthful and always allows the truth to avail. Along came al-Kulaynī and proved al-Ṣadūq to be a liar, by reporting that the Qur'ān contained seventeen thousand verses as has already been discussed. How much more injustice of the Shīʿah must we discuss in this regard? I have not seen any intelligent scholar who has interpreted this verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

> *Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.*[2]

To mean anything else but the Qur'ān is protected from all alterations and changes, whether it be from the first, second or third khalīfah.

The virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah

If this verse is studied with a perceptive eye, then a great virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah can be seen. The details of this are that whenever any task is carried out

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

under another or by their instruction then even though someone else may carry out the task, it will always be ascribed to the principal, director, or governor. For example, if the president were to appoint a security force or regiment to protect the public treasury and each of them were to take turns guarding it, while he is sound asleep, then this action will still be attributed to the president since he is the one who ordered them to carry out this task.

Similarly, the Ahl al-Sunnah in accordance with the order of Allah have stood guard over this treasure and since they could not protect it suitably when it was on paper, they took the liberty of engraving it on their hearts as well. In other words, they dedicated their lives to its protection, preventing Shayṭān and the irreligious from ever carrying out their evil intentions. A thief will always accuse the guard of dishonesty, so here too the Shīʿah instead of showing appreciation to the Ahl al-Sunnah have opted to accuse us of dishonesty.

All virtues erased all that remains is sin

If the Ahl al-Sunnah were to have asked the Shīʿah for some recompense for having fulfilled this duty then perhaps they would have the right to make such an accusation.

Nevertheless, wherever we look in the world, we see the Ahl al-Sunnah as guardians of the Qur'ān, some towns having more than five hundred ḥuffāẓ, but since this is all in accordance with the order of Allah, it should not be attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah but to Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى. The Ahl al-Sunnah should be regarded as the special servants of Allah. This is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى attributed this protection to himself:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

The Shīʿah are akin to those disobedient to the government, such as cut-throats and thieves, because they are enemies of the guardians of the Book of Allah, which is more valuable than any treasury, and the enemies of those who guard the state treasury are none other than thieves and cut-throats.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

In summary the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

Also calls out loudly that the Ahl al-Sunnah are on the truth and the Shīʿah on falsehood, but ears are necessary in order to listen and the following verses fits them perfectly:

خَتَمَ اللّٰهُ عَلَىٰ قُلُوْبِهِمْ وَعَلَىٰ سَمْعِهِمْ

Allah has set a seal upon their hearts and upon their hearing.[2]

Nonetheless, we should not become negligent in trying to make them understand. Perhaps just as Shaykh al-Ṣadūq has accepted one aspect, ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the other Shīʿah may also do the same. However, since it is very difficult for a radical person to accept what you say the first time around, regardless of how clear and convincing your argument might be, it is possible that a Shīʿah might say after reading this discourse that he believes the Qur'ān to be true and unchanged in any way but where does it say that we have to accept Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ also. This is why I present the next verse:

إِلَّا تَنْصُرُوْهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِيْ الْغَارِ إِذْ يَقُوْلُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

If you do not aid him [i.e., the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ] - Allah has already aided him when those who disbelieved had driven him out [of Makkah] as one of two, when they were in the cave and he [i.e., Muḥammad صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ] said to his companion, "Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us."[3]

Ponder over this verse with an open-mind and put aside your pride, does this verse pull you towards the Ahl al-Sunnah or towards the home of the Shīʿah? At

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 7.

3 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 40.

this juncture a saying of Mirzā Kāẓim ʿAlī al-Lakhnawī comes to mind, who was a senior Shīʿah scholar and also respected by Dildār ʿAlī as well. The summary of his statement is:

> People can say what they like about whoever they want but whoever will speak ill of the first Khalīfah, then even according to me he is a kāfir.

A person from the gathering objected saying: "What are you saying, the beliefs of our religion contradict this." He replied:

> I am not saying this, Allah is saying it. There is no difference between the word ṣāḥib and Ṣaḥābī, both have the same meaning and here Allah is bearing testimony to the first khalīfah being a Ṣaḥābī because the word ṣāḥib, which appears in this verse, according to both Sunnī and Shīʿah refers to Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Glory be to Allah! This is how fair-minded people are, like Mirzā Kāẓim ʿAlī, and he was no simpleton; the Shīʿah themselves held him in high esteem. There is scarcely a Shīʿah who does not know of him and follow him. He is not wrong in his deduction as well, whichever way you look at this verse, there is no room for any other interpretation.

Commentary of the verse in Sūrah Tawbah

The explanation of all of this is that the words "صاحبه" (*companion*) that appears in this verse has the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī in Arabic. In addition, the words (*La Taḥzan*) "Do not grieve", prove that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a lover and devotee of The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as well as a true sincere Mu'min. The reason being that telling him not to grieve would have no meaning if he was not, because then he would have been rejoicing at that time as (according to the Shīʿah belief) his enemy, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, was about to be captured. There would have been no need to even shout, the slightest flinch would have given them away.

Also understand that the fear Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had was not for his own life but only for the well-being of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, fearing what they might do if they discovered the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It was on this that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ consoled him saying: "*Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us.*"

The meaning of grief

A few prejudiced individuals have said that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not fearful for the life of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he was fearful for his own. Such claims need to be thought out carefully because it would mean that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is unfamiliar with the prose of the Arabic language and unacquainted with the eloquence of the Arabic language. It would render the miracle of the eloquence of the Qur'ān into murmurings of the smitten.

The details of this is that any person who knows Arabic will be aware that the word "حزن" (grief) is used in times of sadness, when parting with a beloved or in a time of hopelessness, whereas when one fears for his life then the word "خوف" (fear) is used. There is no book more eloquent and articulate as the Qur'ān. When Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ climbed atop Mount Ṭūr and Allah asked him what is in your hand, he replied that it was his staff, with which he walks, leans on, and herds his sheep. He was then ordered to throw it down and when he did, it turned into a huge serpent. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ turned and ran, without looking back, on which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى said:

إِنِّيْ لَا يَخَافُ لَدَيَّ الْمُرْسَلُوْنَ

Indeed, in My presence the messengers do not fear.[1]

This makes it clear that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ feared for his life when he saw the serpent, which is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى said: "Fear not" and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى did not say: "Do not grieve" at this juncture. Similarly, when he un intentionally killed the Qibṭī, he fled fearing for his life, which is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى said:

فَخَرَجَ مِنْهَا خَائِفًا

So he left it, fearful.[2]

Aside from these verses, the word "خوف" (fear) was used many times in the Qur'ān, whenever one feared for his own life. Wherever there was sadness then the word "حزن" (grief) was used. In Sūrah Yūsuf where the sadness of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is mentioned on his separation from Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, as well as his weeping

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 10.

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 21.

continuously, which resulted in his family saying that you will weep for Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام until you will also perish, he replied:

قَالَ إِنَّمَا أَشْكُوْ بَثِّيْ وَحُزْنِيْ إِلَى اللّٰهِ

He said, "I only complain of my suffering and my grief to Allah."[1]

In fact, there are many verses which prove that "حزن" (grief) and "خوف" (fear) have different meanings and one is not used in place of the other.

تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ اَلَّا تَخَافُوْا وَلَا تَحْزَنُوْا

The angels will descend upon them, [saying], "Do not fear and do not grieve."[2]

In this verse both words were used, if they had the same meaning then what was the purpose of mentioning it twice? The truth is that fear and grief are two separate things; fear is used for something that is still going to occur and grief is used when the desire of the heart is lost. The opposite of grief is happiness and the opposite of fear is calm. I feel ashamed of having to explain the difference of grief, happiness, fear, and calm which are such simple things to understand. There is nothing complicated in it at all. What can a person do if someone fails to understand the difference? Nevertheless, it is possible that these prejudiced individuals still have not understood, so I will attempt once again. When a person close to you passes away, then the feeling you experience is called grief and not fear. However, when there is a possibility of you being killed, then the feeling you experience is called fear and this is not called grief. If your child climbs on the roof and is about to jump, then you experience fear, this is not called grief. So, in short, grief is the feeling you experience in times of difficulty and fear is the feeling you experience on the possibility of harm befalling you or one you love. They cannot be used in place of each other

The understanding of the Shīʿah

In a way they are also truthful as they have a rule of understanding things the other way around. For example, ʿAmmār ʿAlī understood falsehood to mean truth, as we have already explained. All of the Shīʿah understand protectors to mean thieves, so

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 86.

2 Sūrah Fuṣṣilat: 30.

if here too they were to do the same then the Ahl al-Sunnah should not complain but rather rejoice because agreement has been reached regarding the meaning, the difference remains in the terminology.

The summary of this is that truth in the terminology of the Shīʿah is called falsehood, protector is thief and grief is called fear. However, just as a Hindu and an Englishman when in a gathering of Muslims, hears one calling another "Baba", then in accordance with their terminology; the Englishman will think it to mean child and the Hindu will think it to mean grandfather, here too if the Shīʿah understands "*Grieve not*" to mean "Do not fear" then it is no fault of theirs, it is incumbent on the Ahl al-Sunnah to speak to them in their terminology. Is it not stated in ḥadīth:

كلموا الناس على قدر عقولهم

Speak to people according to their mental capacity.[1]

Even if we were to consider "*Grieve not*" to mean "Fear not", as the Shīʿah do, then too it does not harm us, as then "O Abū Bakr! Do not fear!" would mean that he did fear for his life because the disbelievers hated him on account of him being a Muslim and having īmān. If this were not so then what why would the Prophet ﷺ comfort him? That too by saying: "*Allah is with us!*" Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ only assists and aids — he is only "with" — the believers:

وَأَنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

Allah is with the believers.[2]

أَنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Allah is with the righteous [who fear Him].[3]

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الَّذِيْنَ اتَّقَوْا وَّالَّذِيْنَ هُم مُّحْسِنُوْنَ

Indeed, Allah is with those who fear Him and those who are doers of good.[4]

---

1 *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*: 29282; *Al-Firdaws bi-Maʾthūr al-Khiṭāb*: 1611. With the following wording:
أمرنا أن نكلم الناس على قدر عقولهم

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 19.

3 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 36.

4 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 128.

The Qur'ān is filled with such verses, the summary of which is that Allah is with those who are pure-hearted and nowhere in the Qur'ān will you ever find Allah saying that he is with the disbelievers, the evil-doers, or the hypocrites.

The true meaning of Allah being "with" a person

If any person were to say that Allah is with everybody, whether a believer or disbeliever, as it is mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān:

أَلَا إِنَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ مُّحِيطٌ

Unquestionably He is, of all things, encompassing.[1]

Therefore, since Allah encompasses everything, it necessarily means that Allah is with everything.

The answer to this would be as follows, considering one can be with another in two ways:

1. The first is when two people are in one place at the same time. Here they are only with each other physically though they both might abhor each other. An example of this would be a parrot living in the same cage with a crow.

2. The second is where one is in the heart of the other. For example, if a king were to say to a destitute person, who is disliked by others: "Fear not, for we are with you." The meaning of this statement is simply that your thought will be in our minds and your concern will occupy us such that we will assist you when required.

In the second instance, it is not necessary for the poor person and the king to be in the same place. He might not be with him physically but his assistance is definitely with him.

Therefore, in the verse:

أَنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Allah is with the righteous [who fear Him].[2]

1 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 54.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 36.

As well as the other verses mentioned above, the second meaning will be implied, as is known to all. If this were not the case, then what sort of praise would this be for the pious and how will it console them? So too in the verse under discussion, it was only mentioned with the purpose of consoling and to re-enforce the promise of assistance made above.

The verse proves that assistance descended upon Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well

If one were to object further and claim that the verse above establishes that divine assistance descended upon the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not upon Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, we would reply that this is known to all and sundry that the humiliation and disgrace of a slave is considered a humiliation and disgrace upon his master. When a person harms the servants and workers of the British then why do they take it so personally that they call to arms, spilling the blood of thousands? Furthermore, we witnessed during the riots that whoever protected the government officials were considered to be loyal subjects of the government. Thus, the assistance of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ falls under the assistance rendered to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. When we were informed of this assistance, we were told:

فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ

Allah has already aided him.

However, when the assistance arrived, it arrived for both because when The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ informed Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about the assistance of Allah, he did so in the following manner:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

In other words, when informing us about this incident, Allah only mentioned the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and said: "*Allah has already aided him*", however, when Allah provided the assistance, He assisted both the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It is for this reason that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ informed Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about Allah's assistance in by saying, "*Indeed, Allah is with us*".

A single word was used "مَعَنَا" (with us) and they were not mentioned separately: "مَعِی" and "مَعَكَ" (it was not said, Allah is with me and Allah is with you), which makes it apparent that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ was with Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the same manner as he was with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

So, based on this we learn that the Shīʿah have unwittingly agreed with us in the fact that just as Allah was with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in terms of help, concern, love and assistance, so too was He with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

In addition, the wording:

ثَانِیَ اثْنَیْنِ

As one of two

Indicates that The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not alone at the time, but another was with him, namely Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Furthermore, it is the *mafʿūl* (passive participle) of the verb preceding it:

اِلَّا تَنْصُرُوْهُ

If you do not aid the Prophet.

Which proves beyond all doubt that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was also included in the divine assistance.

If the Shīʿah were to then argue that the statement of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

is in actual fact affixed to the sentence:

اِذْ اَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِیْنَ كَفَرُوْا

When those who disbelieved had driven him out.

and is in fact its *mafʿūl* (passive participle), rendering its meaning to be that at the time, when the disbelievers of Makkah drove the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ out of Makkah,

he was not alone, rather his acquaintance was with him. In this manner it will have no connection with the divine assistance. The divine assistance would only apply if it had been affixed to:

فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ

Allah has already aided him.

To this rhetoric, we give the following answer: if this is the meaning of this verse then it is exactly what we desired. As in this case it would mean that the Shīʿah too have learnt that the kuffār had the same enmity for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ as they had for the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

If anyone were to say that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was not driven out by the kuffār but rather it was the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who asked him to accompany him then we ask the Shīʿah to answer this, as this meaning was only expounded by us on account of them. If they were to have asked us its meaning in the first place, then we would have related it to them. In addition, the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not driven out according to the literal meaning of the word, whereby they dragged him along and expelled him.

The actual course of events

The actual course of events was that the disbelievers had gathered at Dār al-Nadwah, which was the courtyard in the home of Abū Jahl, at that time situated next to the Kaʿbah, where the Ḥanafī Muṣallah was later built and today forms part of the Masjid al-Ḥarām. It was here where they consulted with each other as to what course of action they should adopt with the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; should they imprison him; or was killing him more appropriate or perhaps even to exile him. Allah informed his beloved about their plans and the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ took Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ with him as his companion and they set out for the Cave of Thawr, and after acquiring the necessary provisions they set off for Madīnah three days later. This incident is briefly made reference to in Sūrah al-Anfāl:

وَإِذْ يَمْكُرُ بِكَ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا لِيُثْبِتُوْكَ أَوْ يَقْتُلُوْكَ أَوْ يُخْرِجُوْكَ ۚ وَيَمْكُرُوْنَ وَيَمْكُرُ اللّٰهُ ۖ وَاللّٰهُ خَيْرُ الْمَاكِرِيْنَ

> *And [remember, O Muhammad], when those who disbelieved plotted against you to restrain you or kill you or evict you [from Makkah]. But they plan, and Allah plans. And Allah is the best of planners.*[1]

Ponder over this incident! You will come to the conclusion that the Prophet ﷺ was not physically thrown out of his homeland. If one were to argue that constantly fearing exile is tantamount to exile itself, then we ask: what peace did Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه enjoy from the kuffār? In fact, before this event they had already attempted to exile him had it not been for the intercession of Ibn Daghīnah who warded them off. These narrations can be found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Furthermore, there is nothing illogical about things transpiring in this particular manner as the manner in which Allah سبحانه وتعالى makes mention of this in the Noble Qur'ān:

إِذْ يَقُوْلُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

He said to his companion, "Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us."[2]

Informs us that the disbelievers hated Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as well; if not then why would the Prophet ﷺ console him and why would Allah be with him and then too in the same manner that He was with the Prophet ﷺ.

After listening to this discussion, we are entirely convinced that the Shī'ah will never mention that the Prophet ﷺ only took Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along so that he will be unable to inform the disbelievers of his whereabouts. This verse has ripped to shreds the entire basis of this possibility such that even if they were to labour until the end of days, they will never be able to construct it again.

Furthermore, the beloved messenger; the Prophet ﷺ, Allah forbid, was not lacking in intelligence but rather his intelligence was legendary; did he not perceive the terrible outcome of informing Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه of his plans and instead rather keep him in the dark from the outset and not tell him: "I am going to take refuge in the Cave of Thawr."

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not an imām of the Shī'ah, who was blessed with the knowledge of all that has passed and what will come to pass, such that he would have known of

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 30.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 40.

the plans of the Prophet ﷺ whether he informed him of it or not. Furthermore, *taqiyyah* (dissimulation) would be most necessary in this circumstance and according to the Shīʿah, the Prophet ﷺ taking refuge in the cave is also a form of taqiyyah, the details of which will be discussed later. Nevertheless, according to the Shīʿah paradigm, taqiyyah is compulsory in such instances and to lie in such a circumstance is not only permissible, but rather essential. Instead, they claim that the praises which the illustrious Imāms adorned the three Khulafā' with, as well as the other Ṣaḥābah, was in actual fact taqiyyah. Allah forbid! The actions of the Prophet ﷺ negate any possibility of such deceit, as then what need was there to take Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along with him to the Cave of Thawr. If he were to have gone on his own then he would have had no fear, but by taking him along the very fear because of which he was taking him along would multiply. What was there to prevent him from yelling out and giving away their position? This would then be a perfect example of the saying:

> *To avoid the rain, he stood beneath the tap.*
>
> *To save himself from the sun, he jumped into the fire.*

Thus, if this was the wisdom of taking Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along then this was extremely unwise indeed.

The involuntary rectification to the truth

This is the reason why Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī was forced to write in *Īthār al-Ḥaqq* that this possibility is indeed far-fetched. However, this is akin to the parable of the Hindu pundit, who denounced Hinduism after seventy-years but did not have the courage to announce it publicly out of fear for his own status.

Now listen to what I have to say, the statement of Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī is absolutely correct and if it is on account of this that he has named his book *Īthār al-Ḥaqq* (declaration of the truth) then it has earned its title. We too are not afraid to accept this, even if he may be of the Shīʿah faith. The problem however, is that despite Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī being a recognised leader of the Shīʿah, by the Shīʿah scholars and common masses alike, they are not prepared to accept his word. Instead, they all claim: "What is astonishing about the Prophet ﷺ taking Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along on this journey? He had taken him with only because he had given his daughter to the Prophet ﷺ in marriage and he embraced

Islam prior to many others, spending a great deal of his time in the service of the Prophet ﷺ." The possibility of the Shīʿah reforming is minimal but in fact it is highly possible that they will dissociate themselves from this scholar instead.

The true events of hijrah

Whether a person accepts or does not accept, the heart testifies, whether Ahl al-Sunnah or Shīʿah, that the only reason why Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was taken along on this journey was because the kuffār understood him to be the adviser, aide, and supporter of the Prophet ﷺ. They also knew him to be the close friend and beloved of the Prophet ﷺ and why should they not? Ahl al-Sunnah or Shīʿah, none are ignorant of the fact that it was Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه who suffered alongside the Prophet ﷺ at the hands of the kuffār, who defended the Prophet ﷺ, spent his wealth on him, and endured great difficulty. He liberated Bilāl رضي الله عنه from the shackles of the disbelievers. Similarly, he sacrificed his entire family for the pleasure of Allah and His messenger.

This is why the Prophet ﷺ was convinced that the kuffār bore the same hatred for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as they bore for him and the very same punishment, they had planned for him; they had planned for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. He had challenged many of the kuffār and repeatedly informed them that the dīn of Islam is the true dīn, so abandon your worship of these idols. If success is what you seek then follow the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. The Prophet ﷺ was convinced that if he were to leave Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه behind then the kuffār would most definitely execute him.

Without a doubt, if ʿUmar رضي الله عنه were to be left behind then there would be no room for concern as the kuffār would not dare quarrel with him on account of the kuffār still having some form of regard for him, the most significant point of which would be that he was the maternal nephew of their leader, Abū Jahl, whereas the other Ṣaḥābah had no such privilege. Most importantly ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was capable of defending himself.

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the other hand was a thorn in the side of the disbelievers and they would writhe in anger at the mere sight of him. If he were to be killed, then a great stalwart of īmān and Islam would be lost. If he were to be killed then such a companion would be lost whose compassion and sincerity was exemplary, such

sincerity and love that it would leave an indelible mark on the heart, influencing the actions of others.

Moreover such a dangerous journey cannot be undertaken without a companion and the companion should be such that he has no concern for his own life, his familial love should not supersede his love for Allah and His messenger, he should be experienced in both summer and winter weather patterns, a seasoned traveller, intelligent, wise to the ways of the world, possessing great courage, of high disposition, forthright, one whose trustworthiness has been tested time and again, devout, one for whom the speech stored in the chambers of the heart is opened, a pure hearted soul, and one in whose company, perplexity, strangeness and anxiety all dissipate. The Prophet ﷺ saw all these qualities only in Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and this is the reason why he went to his house in the afternoon, arranged all travel plans with him after which both arrived at the Cave of Thawr. ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه, the son of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, acted as a spy for them and related all information he could glean from the disbelievers to the Prophet ﷺ and his father.

Responding to the Shīʿah perception

If the family of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه bore any enmity to the Prophet ﷺ then would such arrangements have been possible? If we were to hypothetically accept that this conspiracy was possible then what better opportunity could he have had to actualize his 'enmity' and fulfil his wishes by handing over the Prophet ﷺ to the disbelievers? The Shīʿah should study their own books and inform me if I have been false in relating this incident. If any difference is found, then he is free to do as he pleases. A fair-minded person will be left with no other alternative but to acknowledge the fact that the Prophet ﷺ taking Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along with him as his companion on *hijrah* (migration) is such a great virtue that it cannot be equalled by any other, such that even ʿAlī رضي الله عنه sleeping in the bed of the Prophet cannot equal it.

All would have probably seen, during times of unrest, that when warrants of arrest are issued for the perpetrators, the others who reside in the house are not arrested. On the contrary, whoever is seen as his cohorts or accomplices are regarded to be equally guilty as the perpetrator himself.

It is of considerable regret that the testimony of Allah and his messenger in favour of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is not accepted and then too only because they testify to his īmān. If you do not accept the word of Allah, then what will you accept? This is when you invent various illogical interpretations and are willing to believe the most far-fetched hypothesis such that if it is compared with what the Qur'ān truly says then not even an atom of what the Qur'ān says can be found in it.

The fair-minded interpretation of the verse

We have no doubt that the Shī'ah understand this verse to have the very same meaning as we have expounded; namely that if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was distressed at the time, then it was only because the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was defenceless and at the mercy of the kuffār at that time and he thought to himself: "What can I possibly do alone against these enemies, who will discover us with a simple glance towards their feet."

However, such levels of helplessness and incapacity warrants the assistance of Allah, as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا اسْتَيْأَسَ الرُّسُلُ وَظَنُّوْا أَنَّهُمْ قَدْ كُذِبُوْا جَاءَهُمْ نَصْرُنَا

[They continued] until, when the messengers despaired and were certain that they had been denied, there came to them Our victory.[1]

Similarly, it was on account of the utter despondency of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ at this juncture that the assistance descended and the glad tidings of:

لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

"Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us."[2]

In other words, O Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ! Do not be despondent or sad. Be consoled that our Rabb is with both of us.

Essentially this promise came to pass and both were saved from the evil clutches of the kuffār, and they reached Madīnah safely. The manner in which the light

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 110.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 40.

of Islam shone forth from this point is common knowledge and clearer than the sun. Thus, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ deserves our utmost gratitude and supplications because had it not been for his concern and distress then this outcome would never have materialised. It was on account of this concern and distress that led to the lands of Iran being liberated from the hands of the kuffār, giving the Shīʿah a homeland, but this unappreciative ilk, instead of expressing gratefulness, express such repulsive sentiment towards him, the likes of which no person will articulate for his benefactor.

Another laughable interpretation of the Shīʿah and its refutation

At times some become extremely prejudiced and say that up until this point in time Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was exactly as is understood from the Word of Allah but he did not remain the same thereafter. This pseudo-objection does not merit a response rather it would be better for the Shīʿah to never utter such an allegation as this would prompt the Hindu and British to mockingly say: "Farewell to such a deity who is unaware of what is to transpire a few days from now." Furthermore, if we were to hypothetically accept this (merely relating the outcome of their belief but not ascribing to it) that Allah was unaware of the crimes which Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would later perpetrate and only erroneously uttered these remarks, then it would demand that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى prove His Word to be true and bring the 'deceiving' Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ back to the straight path, by force if need be. After all, this is the Lord and Master of the Universe we are talking about and not some ordinary being, who would sit idly by while his word is proven false. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى said to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: "I am with you", and Allah has also said:

لَا تَبْدِيْلَ لِكَلِمَاتِ اللّٰهِ

No change is there in the words [i.e., decrees] of Allah.[1]

مَا يُبَدَّلُ الْقَوْلُ لَدَيَّ

The word [i.e., decree] will not be changed with Me.[2]

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 64.

2 Sūrah Qāf: 29.

Both verses have the same meaning, which is that the word of Allah does not change. How then is it possible that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ abandoned Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, such that Shayṭān then took hold of him or to put it more blatantly that Allah was with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but then could not withstand the onslaught of Shayṭān and was forced to abandon him. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is indeed pure and above that. Instead, it would be more prudent for the Shīʿah to never utter such allegations.

The wording of the verse utterly silences any Shīʿah response

They fail to understand that firstly the statement:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

is such a sentence, that in accordance with Arabic prose, it denotes perpetuity. Those acquainted with Arabic and the laws of *balāghah* (eloquence) would be well-aware of this, and even to ʿAmmār ʿAlī, this much is absolutely certain.

Secondly, if we were to all accept that this verse does not prove any perpetuity then the Shīʿah will have to admit to the fact that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ jointly shared in the closeness and assistance at that moment. Now, it is absolutely impossible that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ ever separated from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and abandoned being close to him and assisting him. This implies that the share of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in the verse, "*Indeed Allah is with us*", was in fact perpetual, which would warrant that the share of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also be perpetual. The reason being that both were referred to in one instance and not separately; the words "**مَعِيَ**" (with me) and "**مَعَكَ**" (with you) were not used.

Thirdly, even if we were to overlook all of the above, we will say that the statement of Shayṭān appears in Sūrah al-Ṣād as follows:

قَالَ فَبِعِزَّتِكَ لَأُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ أَجْمَعِيْنَ – إِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ

[Iblees] said, "By Your might, I will surely mislead them all. Except, among them, Your chosen servants".[1]

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82.

As they are beyond his reach on account of them being under the refuge of Allah. In Sūrah al-Ḥijr, after the words: "*Except your sincere slaves from amongst them*", Allah by way of attestation to the words of Shayṭān states:

إِنَّ عِبَادِيْ لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطَانٌ

Indeed, over My [believing] servants there is for you no authority.[1]

In other words, Shayṭān is being told that you are truthful in your statement that whoever seeks refuge in Me, you will have no influence over them. Therefore, ponder deeply over this verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

It clearly proves Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ having come into the refuge of Allah, in other words that he has come into the court or within the borders of Allah. So Shayṭān does not have the ability to remove anybody from this proximity, so then who is there who can remove Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ? If they respond by saying that Allah Himself has removed Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ then this is in itself incorrect as Allah has said:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتّٰى يُغَيِّرُوْا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ

Indeed, Allah will not change the condition of a people until they change what is in themselves.[2]

The impossibility of his condition changing

Moreover, it was impossible for the condition of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ to have changed on account of satanic enticement or deception because it is evident, in fact clearer than the sun, that capability is required in order to carry out any action. In order for one to give charity, generosity is required. Similarly, to march into battle would first require bravery. The same applies in evil and sin as well, it too requires an ability or capability. Thus, if that ability did exist within him then Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى removed it. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says it so beautifully in the Qur'ān:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42.

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 11.

اَلْخَبِيْثٰتُ لِلْخَبِيْثِيْنَ وَ الْخَبِيْثُوْنَ لِلْخَبِيْثٰتِ ۚ وَ الطَّيِّبٰتُ لِلطَّيِّبِيْنَ وَ الطَّيِّبُوْنَ لِلطَّيِّبٰتِ ۚ

Evil words are for evil men, and evil men are [subjected] to evil words. And good words are for good men, and good men are [an object] of good words.[1]

In fact, the statement that was made at this juncture:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

establishes that Allah will not be separated from him. The reason being that if the statement:

وَأَنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

Allah is with the believers.[2]

Were to have been mentioned after the words:

لَا تَحْزَنْ

Grieve not.

Then too we would understand that Allah will only be with us as long as we have īmān and īmān is a prerequisite for the proximity of Allah. If one were to lose his īmān then we would understand that he has lost the proximity to Allah as well. However, in this instance, where Allah has not mentioned any condition for His proximity, it will mean that it is perpetual and will never be lost. The connection created through the bonds of blood can never be broken whereas those friendships based upon good character and goodness will remain as long as the good character and goodness prevails. This is the reason why friendships often break but familial ties remain intact. In essence, familial ties are attached to yourself whereas the ties of friendship are attached to acts of virtue. Therefore, since Allah said:

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 26.

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 19.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Indeed, Allah is with us.

And not:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

Indeed, Allah is with the believers.

Or any other expression, whereby it requires a particular quality, it becomes known that the ties of togetherness between Allah and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ is attached to his person and not any particular quality (that may be lost tomorrow).

Thus, if the relationship were to change then it would change in accordance with the verse:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتّٰى يُغَيِّرُوْا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ

Indeed, Allah will not change the condition of a people until they change what is in themselves.[1]

This stipulates that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى changes the relationship on account of the qualities in a person changing. So, when a change in relationship arises it will be on account of those qualities (on which the relationship was based) having changed and not without reason. The corollary of the Shīʿah argument would be that Allah had committed a major oversight for failing to mention the quality upon which the relationship was based (i.e. in the verse: "*Indeed Allah is with us!*") and instead of saying:

Verily Allah is with the believers.

erroneously said:

Indeed, Allah is with us.

We seek refuge in Allah from such evil misunderstandings and from ever perceiving that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى could err or forget. Verily Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is as described by Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 11.

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّیْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Lord neither errs nor forgets.[1]

The status of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Objectively, if impartiality were to reign, then the words "*With us*" would be understood to accord Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a status close too (but below) that of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which is a level of proximity that he has conferred on both of them. This will make it incumbent to award him the title of "al-Ṣiddīq al-Akbar" and that he be regarded as the most superior of not only this Ummah but of previous nations as well (aside from the Ambiyā'). If it is said that the ceiling of his status was the floor level of that of nubuwwah, which is suitably provided by the fact that he was a partner to the messenger in a certain matter, then both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah know that there is no station which is linked to the station of nubuwwah other than the station of Ṣiddīqiyyah. The reason being that Allah makes mention of the Ṣiddīqīn immediately after the Ambiyā', which informs us that in every nation there will be a Ṣiddīq whose status will be connected to that of the Nabī and fall just under the status of that Nabī. Since the nubuwwah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ surpasses that of the other Ambiyā' so too will the Ṣiddīq of this nation surpass the Ṣiddīqīn of all other nations.

This should suffice for the objective and if Allah grants understanding to the prejudiced then only will they understand. Where is it possible for a weak person such as myself to make them understand? However, it is incumbent upon me to mention this much as an advice:

The enemies of those whom Allah has sided with are doomed.

Another Shīʿah diversion

After the discussion above, the only avenue left for one to adopt would be to say that:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us.

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52.

is in reality not the speech of Allah but the speech of the Prophet ﷺ and Allah is simply narrating it and not speaking from Himself. Whatever emanated from the blessed tongue of the Nabī ﷺ, Allah quoted verbatim just as He quoted the statement of Firʿawn:

اَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْاَعْلٰى

And said, "I am your most exalted lord."[1]

And the statement of Shayṭān:

اَنَا خَيْرٌ مِّنْهُ

I am better than him.[2]

Even though the Prophet ﷺ was a Nabī, he was still a human being and as is well-known, man is prone to mistakes and forgetfulness. So, it is not far-fetched that the Prophet ﷺ could have made a mistake.

The answer to this assertion, which must be a source of great pride for the Shīʿah and bringing no less joy for them than the celebration of ʿĪd Bābā Shajāʿ al-Dīn3, and even though they are prepared to claim a donkey as their father to distance themselves from the truth expounded by the Ahl al-Sunnah, they will have to listen to what I say, they need not read the entire Sūrah but merely this verse:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوٰى اِنْ هُوَ اِلَّا وَحْىٌ يُّوْحٰى

Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.[4]

There is no possibility of whims and fancies, no exaggerated praise or deception nor anything based upon personal understanding.

The third khalīfah ʿUthmān رضی اللہ عنہ (according to the Shīʿah) removed many verses from the Qur'ān, which expound the virtues and superiority of ʿAlī رضی اللہ عنہ, the 'waṣī

1 Sūrah al-Nāziʿāt: 24.

2 Sūrah Ṣād: 76.

3 ʿĪd Bābā Shajāʿ al-Dīn is a Shīʿī custom wherein they celebrate and rejoice upon the martyrdom of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb at the hands of the Zoroastrian Abū Lū'lū', whom they have awarded the honorary title of *Bābā Shajāʿ al-Dīn*.

4 Sūrah al-Najm: 3,4.

of the Prophet ﷺ', never mind verses, entire sūrahs proving the legitimacy of his khilāfah were removed, so in response, if he were to have removed this one verse, which obviously establishes the excellence of the first khalīfah Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then it would be no less then recompensing evil with evil the like thereof or even less than this, since this is all it establishes. So, the removal of this one verse would in no way be equal to the removal of the thousands of verses in his honour, especially since the removal of this verse will not result in any right being usurped. Furthermore, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه managed to not only remove these verses from the Qur'ān but also remove the honour of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه from the hearts of the people. Nevertheless, I have strayed far off the topic, this verse makes it clear that the statements of the Prophet ﷺ are the statements of Allah, more so when it pertains to the knowledge of the unseen. Since proximity with Allah is not something visible to the eye it is of the first category of unseen knowledge. This includes the verse:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us.

amongst the *mutashābihāt*, which do not allow the application of logic in their interpretation. Thus, it is impossible for any person to say that many impending events are ascertained through the use of the intellect, so similarly in this case, what harm is there if the Prophet ﷺ deduced this by use of his intellect.

On the contrary if it were pertaining to some law of prohibition or permission in dīn then it would be possible to apply ijtihād and there would have been no harm in the Prophet ﷺ doing so, just as the Imāms of the past had done. The Ahl al-Sunnah do indeed believe in the ijtihād of the Nabī ﷺ but when it comes to the verse:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us.

There is no other interpretation except what was clearly mentioned by the Prophet ﷺ as it was all based upon revelation and not the personal opinion or ijtihād of the Prophet ﷺ. There is no interpretation to this verse that can support

the perception of the Shīʿah because if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not accepted in the court of Allah, as the Shīʿah believe, but rather he later turned to kufr then the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would never have comforted him in this manner. What would have prompted the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to lie in this manner?

The lame excuse of taqiyyah

If anybody were to say that it was *taqiyyah* (dissimulation), then the response would be that taqiyyah takes place when there is some form of fear. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not a wrestler and nor was the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ a weakling. Leave alone one opponent, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ defeated many wrestlers. Many opportunities to kill Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ presented itself where no questions would be asked.

Secondly, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had practiced taqiyyah then he would have sufficed himself with compassionate and kind words. The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not limited to these few words of re-assurance, but in terms of speech, he was equipped with great eloquence. After all he was the most eloquent of all, Arabs and non-Arabs alike. If it had been necessary for words of comfort to be used, then there are many other forms of expression at hand and what need was there for deceit.

Furthermore, we seek refuge in Allah that we should have to utter such a thing, but based on the Shīʿah view, if he was coerced into such deceit, then our argument would be that he could have used an insinuation instead. In place of:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve; indeed, Allah is with us.

He could have said:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

Verily Allah is with the believers.

This would have served as an assurance and the matter would have been closed and resolved, and in so doing the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would have been saved from deceit.

If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was indeed a hypocrite, Allah forbid, then by this statement he would think that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ regards him as a believer and friend, and

if on the other hand he was a true believer, who later abandoned Islam then the Prophet ﷺ would still be true in his statement. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ never forgets, so as long as he would remain a believer Allah would be with him and once īmān left his heart then Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ would have also abandoned him.

Explanation of the term "صاحبه" and the claim that it does not have the same meaning of Ṣaḥābī

After this explanation, I will conclude with a caution. It should be borne in mind that certain enemies of intellect might experience difficulty and claim that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

وَمَآ أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُوْلٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانِ قَوْمِهٖ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ

And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people.[1]

Thus, Nabī ﷺ would then speak in accordance with the rules of the Arabic language and as a result of this principle we see that the Noble Qur'ān also articulates itself in accordance with this usage. Thus, the word *ṣāḥib* only means to accompany and it will be unjust to award it the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī, because the word Ṣaḥābī according to the Sharīʿah refers to a person who has in a state of īmān remained in the company of the Prophet ﷺ, whether it be for a little or long while. According to certain ʿUlamā' in order for a person to be considered a Ṣaḥābī, he would have had to remain in the company of the Prophet ﷺ for a long period. Whatever the case may be, the point is that the concept of īmān is inherent to the word Ṣaḥābī and not to the word "*ṣāḥib*". In short, īmān is synonymous with the word Ṣaḥābī and, firstly, the word *ṣāḥib* has no technical definition in the Sharīʿah whereas in Sharīʿah the word that is used is Ṣaḥābī. Secondly, even if we were to accept that the word ṣāḥib is also employed as a technical term, the fact remains that the Qur'ān was revealed in conformity to the Arabic language and not in conformity to technical definitions. Thirdly, even if we were to believe that the companionship of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is established from the word of Allah and that it is also an implicit indication of his īmān, where in this verse does it state that he will remain with īmān until his death. Thus, this verse will not refute those who claim that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had forsaken Islam later.

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 4.

Even if ṣāḥib does not have the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī there is no harm

The answer to these arguments is that the establishment of Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ īmān and him remaining steadfast thereupon has been established through the connation of the blessed words:

اِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ

Except, among them, Your chosen servants.[1]

As well as the words:

اِنَّ عِبَادِىْ لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطٰنٌ

Indeed, My servants – no authority will you have over them[2]

This has already been discussed at length and there is no need for repetition. Thus, when his īmān is established from the above-mentioned verse and companionship is established from the word *ṣāḥib* in the verse, then what meaning of Ṣaḥābī is then found wanting? In this case, even if the word *ṣāḥib* does not have the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī it matters not. Furthermore, the meaning of the word *ṣāḥib* being known while the term Ṣaḥābī only being used in the technical sense; this usage is defined to this age only. Even if it did apply in the era of nubuwwah then too it would be similar to the manner in which the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was known by the name Muḥammad but Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ gave the glad tidings of the coming of Aḥmad, as is mentioned in Sūrah al-Ṣaff. In essence, when two words are synonymous, it is no problem for the less common word to be used instead of the more common one.

As far as the Qur'ān being revealed in accordance with the common usage of Arabic diction, this does not mean that every word Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى uses has to carry the meaning which the Arabs commonly assign to it. The word ṣalāh, zakāh, ṣawm, and ḥajj are all examples of words that do not have their literal meaning but rather a technical definition in Sharīʿah. Thus, the word *ṣāḥib* has been used in the same light.

---

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42.

The correct implication

The general rule is that whenever a new Nabī is sent then he comes with new laws and many a time to understand these new laws, one needs to understand all related issues as well; since most of it was not known before. So, it is not necessary for every word to have the same meaning that it is used for in that language. However, every language has its own laws. When it is difficult to convey a certain concept then it uses commonly used words of that language to convey its theme but now that word will have an additional meaning. Those well-acquainted with the Arabic language will understand both the old and new meanings of words like ṣawm, ṣalāh, etc. This is how the word *ṣāḥib* or Ṣaḥābī should be understood. Thus, one needs to understand the linguistic meaning of *ṣāḥib* and then its technical meaning in Sharīʿah as well. Even though the word *ṣāḥib* is normally used in its linguistic meaning and the word Ṣaḥābī is used with the technical meaning, at the same time, the word *ṣāḥib* is also used for the second meaning (of Ṣaḥābī) but only if ascribed to the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, there should be no confusion as to when the word *ṣāḥib* is used with the technical meaning in Sharīʿah. The people who study the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ will understand this easily.

Therefore, any word mentioned in the Qur'ān or ḥadīth with the technical definition in mind; it would be utterly preposterous to then consider it using its linguistic meaning. Words like ṣalāh, zakāh, ṣawm, etc., need to be understood according to their technical definition of Sharīʿah and very rarely are they used with their linguistic meanings in mind.

If for arguments sake, we were to accept that the word *ṣāḥib* is not intended for its technical definition then too according to common usage it will still be attached to the Prophet ﷺ, because during the time of the Prophet ﷺ whenever the word was used, even by non-believers, they used it to refer to the companions of the Prophet ﷺ. It did not mean that the person referred to was their companion, instead they meant that he was the companion of the Prophet ﷺ. They would say that he deserted our religion and chose the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ.

The word "*ṣāḥib*" has extra merit when compared to the word "Ṣaḥābī"

In actual fact, the word "*ṣāḥib*" having its linguistic meaning here will add more meaning to the verse as opposed to its technical definition. The explanation of this

is that in this instance the word "*ṣāḥib*" will only mean companion and it will refer to the companionship hinted at in the beginning of the verse:

اِذْ هُمَا فِی الْغَارِ

When they were in the cave.

In this instance the meaning of the verse will be:

> Our support came when both of them were in the cave and the Prophet ﷺ was saying to his companion...

It is obvious that such companionship is required at this time which is most sincere, and the sincerity and spirit of sacrifice shown by Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ on this hour cannot be equalled by anyone nor can it be denied. If Allah did not make mention of this companionship here, then too it would not matter as it had become so well-known that it had become an adage. The Shīʿah can deny it and in their hearts, they know that his companionship to the Prophet ﷺ at this moment cannot be equalled by anyone. Even the Prophet ﷺ himself did not regard anyone's friendship to be greater than Abū Bakr's رضی اللہ عنہ. In the same manner the friendship and companionship of the Prophet ﷺ outweighed all others in the eyes of Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ. In this manner, he is considered to be the best amongst the companions of the Prophet ﷺ, and why should he not when Allah سبحانہ وتعالیٰ has announced him being the companion of the Prophet ﷺ in the cave and his title of Al-Ṣiddīq has become so common that even his enemies know this to be his title.

Shīʿah attempts to undermine the right of Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ to khilāfah

One might argue that even if Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ was the best Ṣaḥābī, it does not matter as the right of khilāfah belonged to ʿAlī رضی اللہ عنہ since he was the cousin of the Prophet ﷺ and his son-in-law too, and according to the norms of society the son-in-law is as good as a son, therefore the khilāfah belonged to ʿAlī رضی اللہ عنہ. At the least, Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ should have made a bequest for the khilāfah to pass to ʿAlī رضی اللہ عنہ after his demise but he did no such thing. Instead, he made a bequest in favour of ʿUmar رضی اللہ عنہ.

The reply to this is that such confusion comes about when one equates khilāfah to the hereditary rule of a kingdom. However, for the people of understanding it is clear that khilāfah after nubuwwah is one of the greatest pillars of dīn, whereas hereditary rule is one of the worst concepts in matters of worldly affairs. Therefore,

one cannot equate the highest level of dīn to worldly matters when there is a distinctive difference between the two.

If one compares the Khulafā' of the Ambiyā' with the Khulafā' of knowledge, then that analogy might work since knowledge is also a part of dīn. However, here too it is common knowledge that there is no hereditary rule. It is on account of aptitude and perfection that one is selected. The word khilāfah too suggests the same, as it means deputyship. A deputy is one who is capable of fulfilling the duty of the represented individual. If a number of people are capable of carrying out this duty, then precedence will be granted to the one who surpasses the others. Thus, when Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has been established to be the best after the Ambiyā' then how is it possible for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be more deserving of the right to khilāfah? Yes! Most certainly ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also deserves the post of khilāfah but it will be in order of superiority. As for the accusation of usurping the khilāfah, I ask you that when Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had the most right to be khalīfah that what is wrong if he took the post? It was after all his right, so whose right did he usurp? Furthermore, those who are well-versed with the incidents of history, will be able to inform you whether the khilāfah was thrust on his shoulders by the Ṣaḥābah or whether he snatched it all by himself?

As far as him appointing ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as his successor after him, firstly it needs to be understood again that hereditary has no role in the appointment of a khalīfah. If it did then Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and after her, Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have a greater right than ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As far as them being a woman or children then it should be noted that in many kingdoms women and children still rule while they are assisted by others.

In summary, even if khilāfah were to be determined through ancestry, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would still not have the greatest right to rule and more so it would not have been his right at the time of the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Furthermore, it would still not have been his right when he eventually became the khalīfah, as Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were both alive at the time. However, if khilāfah is like nubuwwah and not akin to the hereditary rule of kingdoms, such that the most qualified and most superior are chosen to rule, then what is wrong with ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ suggesting that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ be the khalīfah, if he had not done so then someone else would have? If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not the most superior, then most certainly this objection would have merit.

Chapter two

The Promise of Succession and Authority

It is also established from the Noble Qur'ān that whatever transpired was correct and in order. If you are not convinced, then here is the fourth verse:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ وَ لَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِّنْۢ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ اَمْنًا ؕ يَعْبُدُوْنَنِيْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِيْ شَيْـًٔا ؕ وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth just as He granted it to those before them and that He will surely establish for them [therein] their religion which He has preferred for them and that He will surely substitute for them, after their fear, security, [for] they worship Me, not associating anything with Me. But whoever disbelieves after that – then those are the defiantly disobedient.[1]

For those who understand the Qur'ān, the purport and implication of this verse is evident. As for those who are not equipped, they may refer to one of the many translations of the Qur'an, which are freely available.

This verse contradicts Shīʿah beliefs

Take a moment to analyse this verse. The promise is specifically being made to the believers of that era and it is not a promise to Muslims in general. Since "*those who believe*" is followed by "*Minkum*" i.e. "*from amongst you*", it refers specifically to the Ṣaḥābah. The addition of "*minkum*" excludes all Muslims who were yet to come into existence. Consequently, this verse has no relationship with the authority and rule which Imām al-Mahdī will attain.

Similarly, the promise is not made to all the believers at that time; it is a select few only and this is also established from the function of "*Min*" i.e. "from" in the word "*minkum*". This is so because when "*min*" is attached to a personal pronoun then it

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55.

either signifies *Tabʿīḍ* (portioning) or *Ibtidā'* (beginning). Since the option of ibtidā' is unanimously ruled out, we are left with tabʿīḍ because those who are eloquent and well-versed with Arabic never use "min" attached to a personal pronoun to denote *Bayān* (explanation), which is the third possible function of the word "*min*".

If we assume for a moment that despite it being impossible for "*min*" to denote bayān, in which case we would have to momentarily disregard that the Qur'ān is the miraculous and unparalleled word of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, and instead consider this construction to be like that of some Urdu-speaking student who has only studied until *Hidāyah al-Naḥw* and committed gross grammatical errors, but still, it would not solve the problem of the Shīʿah. In this instance, "*minkum*" (from amongst you) would refer to all the Ṣaḥābah including the three Khulafā, because they were classified as believers at the time of the revelation of the verse and they had not turned apostate as yet (according to the Shīʿah claim). If some of these individuals were hypocrites who had never embraced Islam at all then the verse would still refer to those whom the Shīʿah claim turned apostate after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The Shīʿah maintain that all verses dealing with the apostates refer to these Ṣaḥābah who left the fold of Islam after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

If this interpretation is to be considered, it would mean that Allah made a promise to these apostates that He would establish the chosen religion for them but He then went against His promise because if He established the dīn then how could their inner-selves and Shayṭān lead them to apostasy? In addition to this, Allah says that when the promise would be fulfilled, they would worship Him alone without ascribing partners to Him. This phrase of the verse could either be regarded as a promise or as *Khabar* (expressing a fact). Whether it be a promise or a khabar, it implies that they would remain steadfast on the path which they were upon, i.e. īmān and righteous deeds, by virtue of which they ultimately were entitled for this reward. Those who understand the implications of the phrase:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds.

extract this meaning from the verse, i.e. that the Ṣaḥābah were being foretold of their succession and dominance on account of believing in Allah and doing righteous deeds.

Considering the meaning of the verse thus far, it makes one wonder how they became apostates. This could only signify one of two things: either Allah went against His promise or He erred in the information given of,

الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ

Those who have believed among you.

A false promise

Conversely, consider the meaning of this verse in the light of Shīʿī belief, and assume that "*Those who have believed among you*" refers to the four or five individuals who remained Muslims after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ and did not turn apostate. If "*min*" denotes *bayān* (explanation) then it implies that the promise of succession is made to every one of these four or five individuals since all of them embraced Islam prior to the revelation of this verse. However, it appears that the promise was fulfilled in respect of only one individual, i.e. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. As for Abū Dhar, Salmān al-Fārsī, Bilāl, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم, the promise made to them was false. The hollowness of the promise with regard to Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه requires no elaboration. As for Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, though he did assume the role of khalīfah for six months, the promise of establishing dīn (i.e. of the Shīʿah) did not materialise at all. This is more evident according to the Shīʿah view since they maintain that Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه, who rejected the position of Imāmah of the Imāms, was in control of the khilāfah and there was no security and peace for Ḥasan رضي الله عنه. If this is not correct then why did he surrender the khilāfah to Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه and choose to pass his entire life in taqiyyah?

As for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, the Ahl al-Sunnah still maintain that he had authority and dominance but this is not true according to the Shīʿah stance. This is because the Shīʿah religion remained obscure throughout his reign and he lived in taqiyyah all along. In fact, he continued to praise the first two Khulafā' publicly, even though they were deceased and he did not have to fear them at all. Never did he get a single opportunity to proclaim the truth and unmask his real identity. As for the promised state of security and peace, this was also not achieved according to the Shīʿah, because ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was constantly in a state of fear from the 'disbelievers'. Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه was there all the time to frustrate him and he eventually snatched a considerable portion of rule away from him.

The summary of this discussion is that if the promise was made to all of them, by asserting that "*min*" denotes *bayān* (explanation), then the word of Allah will be left meaningless and false.

The attempt to misinterpret its meaning

If we were to consider that "min" denotes *bayān* (explanation), despite it being incorrect to attach the personal pronoun to it in this case, and then assume that *Istikhlāf* (granting authority) refers to *Tawaṭṭun* (granting a residence) as some Shīʿī scholars have suggested, then too the meaning of *tawaṭṭun* (granting a residence) cannot be established. This is because istikhlāf is attached to the clause "*Fī al-Arḍ*" i.e. "*upon the earth*" and it can only imply authority and dominance over the land, and not a residence. Similarly, "*and done righteous deeds*" would then have no relevance because residence on earth is enjoyed equally by the righteous and the transgressors. In fact, the transgressors have more advantages in this matter. Moreover, "*Those who have believed*" would also be redundant since there is no shortage of disbelievers enjoying the benefit of residency on earth.

Nevertheless, they have subjected the word of Allah to such futile interpretations in order to avert the consequences of this verse, but the Qur'ān is far beyond such foolishness.

The verse denotes dominance and authority

Refusing to surrender, some Shīʿī scholars have said that, "*Those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds*" refers to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and the plural form has been employed to signify his exaltedness. If not, then it refers to him and his progeny. Assuming that this interpretation has any credibility despite it being incorrect to state that the plural form refers to an individual when there is no need for such an interpretation, and despite it being forbidden to change the plural meaning to an individual one when the plural meaning has validity, then too we would say that none of these people, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ or his progeny, ever enjoyed a state of security and peace as they all lived under taqiyyah.

Therefore, the function of "*min*" (from) can only be for *tabʿīḍ* (portioning) and istikhlāf can only denote authority and dominance on earth. Since "*Those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds*" is plural, it requires three individuals at

least (namely Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ) but if a fourth is added to it (ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ) it could certainly accommodate it.

We have thus established the meaning of this verse as follows: Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ has promised the Ṣaḥābah that at least three individuals amongst them, who possess īmān and do righteous deeds, would definitely assume authority and control on earth; Allah will establish that dīn for them which He has preferred for them and throughout their period of rule, the dīn will suffer no deficiency. Allah will change their condition to one of security and stability after the period of fear they experienced from the enemy. The phrase that follows this could either be a continuation of the promise or it could be foretelling a future event. Either way, it implies that despite enjoying the benefits of authority and leadership and the challenges that come with it, they will continue to worship Allah sincerely and devotedly, without becoming victims of shirk and rebellion.

The correct tafsīr of this verse

It is my humble assertion to the Shīʿī scholars that the promise of Allah can never be false and invalid. Therefore, the individuals to whom this promise was fulfilled necessarily possessed the above-mentioned qualities and by the testimony of Allah they certainly had perfect īmān and acceptable good deeds. In fact, these individuals surpassed their contemporaries in these two traits (i.e. īmān and good deeds) because the reward was promised on the basis of these two traits and it is only logical for it to be conferred to those who excel in these traits. If not, then Allah forbid, this would attribute injustice to Allah, since it implies that the one who was unqualified enjoyed the reward.

According to the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Allah is at liberty to do as He wishes and He has the authority to give what rightfully belongs to one person to another but His wisdom is so perfect that He always grants the benefits to to those who are deserving of it. This is the precise implication of the verse which states that Allah does not oppress anyone in anyway. Similarly, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

اَعْطٰى كُلَّ شَىْءٍ خَلْقَهٗ ثُمَّ هَدٰى

He who gave each thing its form and then guided [it].[1]

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 50.

Allah creates everything in proportion and with specific dimensions and characteristics and then directs it to fulfil appropriate functions and purposes. However, the Shīʿah maintain that Allah is deprived of the free will of doing as He pleases and justice is incumbent and binding upon Him. Considering their view, it would mean that there was absolutely no possibility of anyone surpassing the three Khulafā' in the two traits stated above. Instead, they surpassed and excelled the rest of the Ṣaḥābah.

The sequence of khilāfah is also established from this verse

The natural implication of the above discussion would be that from the three Khulafā', the individual who surpassed his colleagues in these two traits should precede them in assuming authority. This correlation is necessary so that recognition is given on the basis of merit and achievement. Therefore, since this promise was fulfilled to the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, and it was fulfilled in a particular sequence, it serves as a testimony from Allah that the four Khulafā' surpassed the rest of the Ṣaḥābah in īmān and good deeds. It also testifies that whilst they were alive, nobody else was more deserving of assuming authority and that the sequence by which they assumed their roles establishes their distinction and merit as far as īmān and good deeds are concerned. Therefore, the first of them achieved the highest position, then the second and the third to be khalīfah was third in rank and so on.

This verse refers to the four Rightly Guided Khulafā

Whilst Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is considered to be among the Rightly Guided Khulafā, his khilāfah is not associated with the promised authority contained in this verse. This is because he was a child when this verse was revealed and he did not experience the fear referred to in this verse. It is the seniors who had apprehension of harm from the enemy, not the minors. Instead, his inclusion among the Rightly Guided Khulafā is separate from the promise which was fulfilled to the four Khulafā'. This is why his khilāfah did not require establishment of authority otherwise referred to as *tamkīn*.

As for Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who did achieve establishment of authority, it was a political authority and not a religious authority. Those who are well-versed with history are aware of the considerable difference between the nature and circumstances of

the first four Khulafā' and that of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whilst they were abstemious and simple, the manner of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was more similar to the ways of pious kings and men of power and influence. This is why despite him being an illustrious Ṣaḥābī, the Ahl al-Sunnah maintain that he did not qualify to the status of a khalīfah (with the full implications this word carries), but he was more of a pious king and righteous ruler. However, all kings are not the same; consider the difference between Anusherwan and Genghis Khan.

By saying that he resembled a king, it means that if he were compared to the Rightly Guided Khulafā then he would be considered a worldly ruler. This is similar to the manner in which Nabī Sulaimān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is considered to be a man of wealth and affluence, as opposed to the rest of the Ambiyā'. By this classification of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ it should not be inferred that he was like common worldly rulers; oppressive, tyrannical and unscrupulous. On the contrary, his tolerance and compassion for his subjects, and service to them is well documented in history.

In addition to this, he cannot be listed along with the Rightly Guided Khulafā because he was not among those who lived in fear of the disbelievers and suffered insecurity. This condition only passed upon the initial Muhājirīn to Madīnah Munawwarah, and even Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not witness this period. The fear and hardship which the four Rightly Guided Khulafā experienced was not witnessed by others and these facts are recorded in the books of history.

This is why they received the reward and the promise was fulfilled for them exclusively. Their state of fear was brought about due to their accepting īmān and doing righteous deeds and it was only on account of these two matters that they became victims of the enmity of the disbelievers. Similarly, the enmity of the disbelievers was proportionate to the intensity of their faith and their quality of their righteous deeds. Their intensity of faith and good deeds determined the degree of fear they were subjected to. Love for Allah and devotion to him is tested in times of fear and suppression, and this is the criterion for measuring devotion to Allah. So, whoever is subjected to greater fear is subjected to it on the basis of excelling in īmān and righteous deeds.

Nevertheless, it is established that the period of fear was specifically experienced by the first Muhājirīn; however, Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not witness

this test. As for Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he was an infant whilst Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not yet a Muslim.

The basis of this verse is the sacrifices of the Muhājirīn

If one were to ponder over the meaning of this verse, he would learn that the only reason for this promise is that the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, especially the Muhājirīn, despite their lack of provisions and small number in the early years of Islam, opposed a much larger group of the kuffār, all in search of Allah's pleasure and the establishment of dīn. In so doing they created enemies with this larger group and as a result had to endure untold torture, abuse and persecution. They lived in fear for many years, such that a time soon came when their homes no longer remained safe-havens and they were forced to leave everything they held dear and migrate to another land. This too did not satisfy the kuffār and many battles ensued thereafter, wherein many of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār were martyred. Once they were thoroughly tested by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, His immense Mercy knew no bounds and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى resolved to reward them in this world as well. In recompense for all the difficulties and hardships they had to endure, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى showered his bounties upon them and granted them peace and comfort. On account of the kuffār having authority over them, which was the principle cause of all the hardships and persecution, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى granted them the khilāfah. On account of the kuffār having authority over them, fasts, ṣalāh, and praises of Allah could not be made, which resulted in them having to bear anguish in their hearts, in fact this too was the reason for their exile. In recompense for this sacrifice, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى established His dīn for them and fear was replaced with peace. This explanation should make it clear that the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ undoubtedly have a unique virtue but this virtue alone does not make them deserving of khilāfah, this is the fruit of the very sacrifice mentioned above.

This verse also reveals the secret behind khilāfah being reserved for the Quraysh

The reason for khilāfah being reserved for the Quraysh is also learnt from this verse. In other words, the meaning of the ḥadīth, which advocates that the right of khilāfah belongs to the Quraysh and the Anṣār have no right to it, is learnt from this verse. The reason for this is that Khilāfah is in actual fact a reward and recompense

for the sacrifices of the Muhājirīn, and since the Muhājirīn are from the Quraysh, khilāfah should be restricted to them. However, the positions of assistance such as that of the qāḍī, etc, can be held by the Anṣār. This also makes it clear that the khilāfah attained by Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not the fulfilment of the promise made in this verse. In addition, it is also clear to those of understanding and the fair-minded that whatever laws of dīn came to the fore or became common practice during the reign of these Khulafā', such as Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not handing over the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ prohibiting mutʿāh and establishing tarāwīḥ, and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ adding another adhān to the Jumuʿah ṣalāh; are all desired by dīn and a realisation of the verse:

دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِىْ ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

Their religion which He has preferred for them.

In a similar manner, whatever ruling they come to consensus and agreement on, it is without a doubt correct and whoever discards it has discarded the dīn chosen by Allah and whoever denies it, denies the truth.

This verse proves the innocence of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Furthermore, aside from the sentence:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth.

being a clear proof for the legitimacy of the khilāfah of the first three Khulafā', it also totally annihilates the Shīʿah presumption that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ prevented the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from writing the declaration for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as khalīfah in his final illness. Those with perception will understand that the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

He will surely establish for them [therein] their religion which He has preferred for them.

removes any possibility of this because when the khilāfah of the first three Khulafā' is the promised khilāfah then the establishment of their khilāfah will be the establishment of the dīn chosen by Allah. With certainty, if khilāfah were not a matter of dīn, then this substantiation would not have been possible. Thus, the Shīʿah cannot deny this as then they will have to declare ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his progeny to be desirous of worldly possessions, Allah forbid. In essence, this accusation and many others which the Shīʿah and Khawārij make against the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, on account of their misconceptions will be refuted. Even though all these accusations, according to those with foresight, are the result of flawed understanding. Allah willing, this will become more apparent in the discussion on Fadak which will be discussed shortly. It might not have been necessary to discuss the incident of the pen and paper at this juncture, as it is out of place and has no link to the actual discussion, but since it is one of the major accusations that the Shīʿah make against the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, I will elaborate on it briefly, based upon the principle that if the primary evidence is shattered then the case itself has ended.

The reasons why the order of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could not be fulfilled

Firstly, it is not mentioned in any narration that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the person who prevented the pen and paper from being brought. In fact, when the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked for it, then ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was amongst many who were in the room at the time. They differed as to what the cause of action should be; some said the instruction should be carried out and others felt that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ should not be put into any further pain. As a result of this difference of opinions, much shouting erupted. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of the opinion that this instruction was not one of obligation but rather out of concern and compassion for the Ummah, as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had already previously said:

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِيْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

Since Allah has perfected and completed the dīn of Islam, this is no new matter of dīn that needs to be written nor any further elaboration of any law. It is not anything fundamental that requires writing at that precise moment, rendering it compulsory to write, but instead it was the concern and care of the Prophet ﷺ that prompted him to make this request. So, when the Prophet ﷺ showed such concern for us in such a time of difficulty then is it not befitting that we too show the same concern for him in his pain and distress? In fact, etiquette would necessitate that it not be considered and the moment be allowed to pass. If a father in a time of extreme hunger were to hand over his portion of food to his son and urge him to eat, then would it be appropriate for the son to show no concern for his father and consume it greedily? Instead in such a time, etiquette would demand that the son not listen to his father and regard his 'disobedience' to be a means of his own salvation. It is for this reason and also so that the noise would be put to an end that he said:

حسبنا كتاب الله

The Qur'ān is sufficient for us.

So then why is there a need to cause harm to the Prophet ﷺ in this manner? If some narration in some rare volume that proves beyond any doubt that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was the first person to make this objection were to be presented by some Shīʿah then aside from whether that narration is authentic or not and not some fabrication, it will have no bearing on account of the reasons stated above. Nevertheless, this accusation is based upon lack of understanding, poor insight and obtuseness. When one peruses through the outcome of this event then he will conclude that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was indeed correct. When the noise level increased, the Prophet ﷺ addressed the entire congregation, asking them all to leave. If this were a divine instruction, compulsory or incumbent, then the Prophet ﷺ would have repeated his instruction with more authority. In a similar manner if the noise was not the reason for the Prophet's ﷺ distress, as understood by ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, then he would have never asked them all to leave.

The weight of Umar's رضي الله عنه opinion

It can also be said that just as on many occasions the opinion of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, even though contrary to that of the Prophet ﷺ, was in accordance with the opinion

of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, resulting in *waḥī* (revelation) descending in agreement with his opinion, here too the opinion of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was in accordance with the opinion of Allah. If this were not the case then just as when the kuffār would question the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and waḥī would descend affirming the word of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, so would it have descended here as well, affirming the instruction of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Unquestionably, this much still remains that in this instance no waḥī descended affirming the opinion of Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ either perhaps after affirming his opinion approximately sixteen times previously, it was regarded to be sufficient and therefore on this one occasion waḥī did not descend. Furthermore, in light of the verse:

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِيْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.

This was not any necessary law of dīn, as already discussed. In addition, this was the final moments of the life of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, a time where all attention and focus is directed to Allah, how then would it have been appropriate to occupy the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ with something that was not compulsory. Thus, even though revelation did not descend affirming the opinion of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the truth of his words, these accusations still do not have any basis. The words of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are worthy of praise from any person having sound intellect.

ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not the one instructed to bring the pen and paper

If any person still finds it hard to accept, on account of his own prejudice, that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked for the pen and paper out of concern for this ummah and still regards this instruction to have been compulsory to obey, then the accusation will not fall on ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone but all of the Ahl al-Bayt and all the Ṣaḥābah will be equally guilty. In fact, the Ahl al-Bayt will be the guiltiest since any instruction or prohibition of a sick person is firstly directed to his household. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a guest, who had come to visit for a moment or two. If there was any fear for him then they could have waited until he left and there was no one to prevent them from fulfilling the order. Moreover, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lived a few days after this,

and if this instruction had been compulsory, as the hearts of the Shīʿah so desire, then it would make the Prophet ﷺ the guiltiest, Allah forbid, because just as it is incumbent upon us to obey Allah and His Messenger, it is more incumbent upon the Nabī to propagate the laws of dīn. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّغْ مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ ۭ وَاِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهٗ ۭ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.[1]

The verses of the Qur'ān and aḥādīth of the Prophet ﷺ all attest to the same, which is why we can say without any doubt that the propagation of the laws of dīn is more incumbent upon the Nabī than us practicing upon on it. It is also evident that the propagation of dīn will only be fulfilled when it is propagated in words. Simply asking for a pen and paper to be brought and having it written, that if you act on this then you will not go astray, will not fulfil the obligation of propagation. If in this case, there was any sort of shortcoming from ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ then too his obedience to the Prophet ﷺ will not have been tainted. If the Shīʿah will ascribe such shortcomings to the Prophet ﷺ and the Ahl al-Bayt, Allah forbid, then we too have no qualms of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ being included with them.

Where did the Shīʿah learn of the intention of the Prophet ﷺ

How did the Shīʿah conclude from the Prophet ﷺ asking for a pen and paper that he desired to write a decree in favour of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ as khalīfah? The apparent wording of the Prophet ﷺ suggests that he wished write such a summary of the tenets of Islam that would serve as a fortress for the īmān of Muslims or list those practices which are absolutely essential in dīn, after all the Prophet ﷺ did say: "If you practice upon it then I bear witness that you will never go astray." Signalling a particular person out for the khilāfah will not fulfil the condition stipulated, which is obvious. This only prompts far-fetched and impossible interpretations, which any person is capable of doing. Even if we were to hypothetically accept that this was a decree making the khilāfah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ incumbent upon all, then for how long was this to last? No mention is made of anyone after ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ whereas the narrations clearly state that you will never go astray ever after that. Let us say,

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67.

hypothetically, that this was a decree for khilāfah; where does it state that it was for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had left both logical and verbal proof for the khilāfah of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If you ask where the verbal proof is then it can be found in the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*[1] of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consider the following narration:

> عن عائشة رضي الله عنها قالت : قال لي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في مرضه : ادعي لي أبا بكر وأخاك _ يعني عبد الرحمن _ حتى أكتب كتاباً ، فإني أخاف أن يتمنى متمن ويقول قائل : أنا أولى ، ويأبى الله والمؤمنون إلا أبا بكر
>
> ʿĀ'ishah reported that Allah's Messenger صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in his (last) illness asked me to call Abū Bakr, her father, and her brother too, so that he might write a document, for he feared that someone else might be desirous (of succeeding him) and that some claimant may say:
>
> > I have better claim to it, whereas Allah and the Faithful do not substantiate the claim of anyone but that of Abu Bakr.[2]

The khilāfah of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will be the most logical conclusion

This narration establishes that if The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did intend to make a decree regarding the khilāfah then it would have been in favour of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and not ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If you ask what is the logical proof, then listen well. According to the norm, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ must have been aware that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ might have been hopeful of being his successor and his other relatives and close family would have endeavoured for the same, which would result in this right never reaching the one deserving of it, i.e. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. On the other hand, such hopes would not have occurred to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, according to all people of intellect, nor is there any proof of it or even a hint. If such hopes are proven then it is proven to have been from ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which is why the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was so perplexed and worried. Thus, to the good fortune of the Shīʿah, this thinking of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ turned out to be correct and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ still remained a candidate for the khilāfah and the prediction of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ also turned out to be true; Allah and the believers were not pleased with anyone but Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In summary,

---

1 *Bukhārī*, *Muslim*, *Tirmidhī*, *Abū Dāwūd*, *Nasa'ī*, and *Ibn Mājah.*

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: 2387.

if the name of anyone was to be written as khalīfah then it was the name of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that was going to be written. If anyone has the right to complain against ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then it should be Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, why do the Shīʿah complain? It is as the saying goes:

> *They always see two and two equalling to four loaves bread*
>
> *And a cat only sees birds in his dreams.*

Thus, the Shīʿah, regardless of what the context may be, will always see the khilāfah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the Imāms.

This was just mentioned by the way. Our actual discussion was that the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

> *He will surely establish for them [therein] their religion which He has preferred for them.*

replies all objections raised against the four al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn. In short, this verse establishes the legitimacy of the khilāfah of the first three Khulafā' and also makes apparent their virtue, status and piety. This in itself proves the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the falsehood and deviation of the Shīʿah.

This bounty was in actual fact granted to the four Khulafā' and it is through them that it was attained by others

In order to emphasise my point further, I wish to add that the pronoun "لهم" (for them) indicates that the desired dīn will be established by those who will be appointed as khalīfah and this great bounty will be first granted to the Khulafā' and through them others will benefit from it. They will be the primary recipients and others will attest to it. However, since this could not be understood by the Shīʿah merely from the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ

He will surely establish ...

Allah added the pronoun:

لَهُمْ

... for them.

This establishes that even if others were to render services to dīn, it would all be in assistance to them. Thus, in whichever manner the desired dīn was established, however, fear was transformed into peace; it was all on account of these four Khulafā'. Just as when a president is invited to a feast, his close attendants are also invited on account of him and they partake of the same food as the president. The difference between the two will be the honour awarded to the president.

In this case too, this great bounty was awarded to these four Khulafā' specifically but through them all the Ṣaḥābah were encompassed by it. Every Ṣaḥābī, whether poor or a Bedouin was granted authority and leadership over the kuffār accordingly. In summary, this bounty of khilāfah was specifically for these four beloveds of Allah but all shared in its fruits and all the Ṣaḥābah shared in the favours mentioned in this verse, through the blessings of the four al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn. The Ṣaḥābah are the example of the close attendants of the president and whoever had already embraced Islam at the time when this verse was revealed, such as the forerunners of the Muhājirīn, who are the closest of all and in fact akin to a blood brother. The Tābiʿīn are like the servants and bodyguards of the president and even though all shared in this bounty, the difference will be the honour that was awarded to the Khulafā'.

"Those who are ungrateful..." refers to the ingratitude of the Shīʿah and is a miracle of the Qur'ān

It is also apparent that when the attendants and relatives benefit from the favours showered upon the president then the president need not be thankful and grateful towards them, instead it is the servants and attendants who should express their gratitude towards the president. The ungrateful and bitter instead of expressing their gratitude for the bounties they have enjoyed will always remain scornful and rather throw thorns in the path of the president.

The same applies here with the great bounty of khilāfah, whatever victories, success and growth of Islam occurred from the era of the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn to this day, are all the fruits of their khilāfah. However, since these fruits were going to be enjoyed by the Ṣaḥābah as well as the Muslims of present day and even by the

kuffār until the present day, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ wished to distinguish the status of these four Khulafā' from that of their enemies, and so He said:

وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ

But whoever disbelieves after that - then those are the defiantly disobedient.[1]

In other words, whoever benefits from this bounty, bestowed through these four Khulafā' and do not recognise the source of it, showing ingratitude and even worse yet disrespect, then they are the true sinners and no other sinner can equal them. It is obvious that the final portion of this verse fits no other but the Shīʿah, Khawārij, Nawāṣib, the murderer of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as well as the murderers of ʿUthmān and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. However, since the Shīʿah are the enemies of those who are the primary source of this bounty, the sin resting on their shoulders, on account of their ungratefulness, will be greater that any of the other sects.

Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and a few other Ṣaḥābah did oppose ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but their opposition was like the disagreement between two brothers. Their example and that of the four Khulafā' will be like that of rich brothers and poor brothers, that despite their disagreements with each other they all benefit from the rich brother. In essence, failing to express gratitude while still appreciating the generosity of the affluent brother, is not commonly termed to be ingratitude but rather pride instead. In this instance, whereby all the brothers benefit from the success of one, the graceful act would be for the affluent brother not to become arrogant and spiteful towards those whom he aids. In fact, even if the other brothers were to harm him or show ingratitude towards him, it would still befit him to be gracious and not seek retribution from them and still regard them to be his brothers at the end of the day.

In summary, it is the practice of the people of righteousness that they do not harm their brothers who show ingratitude towards them but rather whatever Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ grants them of worldly and spiritual bounties, they appreciate and do not become boastful. In fact, they act the opposite to those who show ingratitude and instead become more generous. However, if the servant or attendant persists with his insults and hurtful sentiments then he most definitely becomes deserving of punishment.

---

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55.

The Shīʿah have abandoned the fundamental rules of Shīʿism and discarded obedience to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. Instead, they have opted to follow in the footsteps of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. The reason for this is that when ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was informed that the companions of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ were cursing them, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ prohibited his army from cursing Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. This is reported in the most recognised Shīʿah works as well, but sadly the Shīʿah have opted to follow Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ instead and made *tabarrā* (absolving themselves) from the Ṣaḥābah and their unique trait. Most certainly they have not followed the practice of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ of not speaking ill of others but then, where was he theirs to follow in the first place; following the Sunnah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ is the practice of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Subḥān Allāh, what a miraculous verse that it has not left any aspect uncovered. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى made a promise to the Ṣaḥābah and thereafter hinted towards, or rather clearly mentioned their virtues, also reprimanding those who oppose the Ṣaḥābah and then too in such a manner that the description fits them from head to toe.

This verse draws a tight circle around the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah, protecting it from all sides

Undoubtedly if the following words were not mentioned:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا

They worship Me, not associating anything with Me.

And the words "*after this*" did not appear following the statement, "*Those who are defiantly disobedient*", then there would be scope for interpreting the verse to mean that after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate (as per Shīʿah belief) and that this verse refers to real *kufr* (i.e. disbelief) and not showing ingratitude for the bounties of Allah. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has not left anything to pass in His Book.

The people of intelligence have already understood that such īmān and deeds, which are beloved to Allah and which passed the test with such success that Allah awarded them great bounties on account of it; it is impossible that such īmān could ever change into kufr, since such īmān is only the lot of the "*Chosen Slaves*", regarding whom Shayṭān was forced to admit:

قَالَ فَبِعِزَّتِكَ لَاُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ اَجْمَعِيْنَ اِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ

[Iblees] said, "By Your might, I will surely mislead them all. except Your chosen servants among them."[1]

And Allah has also declared:

اِنَّ عِبَادِىْ لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطٰنٌ

Indeed, you will have no power over My bondsmen.[2]

In fact, it is from the Noble Qur'ān that we come to understand that these "*Chosen Slaves*" are either *maḥfūẓ* (protected) from sin or are *maʿsūm* (infallible or incapable) of sin.

The reason for this is the following verse:

كَذٰلِكَ لِنَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ السُّوْٓءَ وَالْفَحْشَآءَ ۚ اِنَّهٗ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ

And thus [it was] that We should avert from him evil and immorality. Indeed, he was of Our chosen servants.[3]

And since it has just been mentioned that the four Khulafā' are also from the "*Chosen Slaves*" of Allah, who are either *mahfūẓ* (protected) from sin or are *maʿsūm* (infallible or incapable) of sin, then how is it possible for the words "*Those who are defiantly disobedient after this*" to apply to them?

Thereafter, for those of lesser understanding, Allah added:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

He will surely establish for them [therein] their religion which He has preferred for them.

So that they do not pollute their tongues and minds by running down the Ṣaḥābah, which will result in them destroying their dīn and īmān, and on account of their cursing the Ṣaḥābah earn the curse of Allah in return.

---

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 24

Furthermore, to make the explanation even clearer for the truly dull and ignorant, Allah mentioned further:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا

They worship Me, not associating anything with Me.

So that any further doubt of apostasy can also be removed, and on account of their warped understanding and low aptitude should not apply the next portion of "*Those who are defiantly disobedient after this*" to the Ṣaḥābah.

With certainty, the verse:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا

They worship Me, not associating anything with Me.

has completely uprooted any possibility of apostasy, which by assuming the impossible might have occurred, since this verse mentions their condition till the end of their lives.

The qualities which Allah has mentioned have been found to be prevalent to the highest degree in the four Khulafā', to such an extent that the Shīʿah themselves are forced to acknowledge the fact that the first three Khulafā', especially ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, followed the laws of Sharīʿah to the letter and made tremendous efforts to spread the dīn. Undoubtedly, they surpassed all in taqwā and *zuhd* (abstinence).

Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (a renowned Shīʿī scholar) in his book *Tanzīḥ al-Ambiyā' wa l-A'immah* and many other Shīʿī scholars as well have also written the same. Although they have not desisted from their usual evil practice and as the saying goes:

المرء يقيس على نفسه

One judges others according to his own standard.

They claim that all of this was only done as a show. However, when we read the verse, "*They worship Me*" and the words before it, it all points to their sincerity.

Thus, this false accusation returns directly back to them.

Accusing the first three Khulafā' of apostasy is tantamount to accusing Allah of deceit

The words "after this" has utterly disgraced the Imāmiyyah sect (the Shīʿah) because, if by assuming the impossible, we suppose that the three Khulafā' had turned apostate after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ, as the Shīʿah assume, then it would mean (Allah forbid) that Allah did not even understand as much as the Shīʿah understood.

Instead of saying: "Those who disbelieve after the demise of Nabī ﷺ", He rather chose to say: "*Those who are defiantly disobedient after this*" and is thus responsible for deceit.

If, however, the statement: "*Those who are defiantly disobedient after this*" is correct then it lends no support to the meaning which the Shīʿah attempt to extract from this verse. Instead, it will contradict what they are saying because if this applies to the three Khulafā', for example, then this will mean that the kufr occurred after the promised favour of Allah had been completed.

In this instance, denial or rejection of the Imāmah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه immediately after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ (which according to the Shīʿah, all of the Ṣaḥābah are guilty of, more so the first three Khulafā') does not constitute kufr. The reason being that, firstly this notion of the Shīʿah that rejecting the Imāmah is tantamount to the rejection of nubuwwah and constitutes kufr is absolutely baseless.

Secondly, it will mean that rejecting the right of the three Khulafā' to khilāfah, which has been established from this verse, will in fact constitute kufr. In this case we have no problem.

Who does "*after that - then those are the defiantly disobedient.*" refer to?

The context of this verse informs us that the correct meaning is that the words: "*Those who are defiantly disobedient after this*" actually refers to the enemies of the Khulafā' and not the Khulafā' themselves.

In addition, the word "kufr" employed in this verse refers to ingratitude for this bounty and not kufr which means disbelief, unless we laboriously endeavour to grant it that meaning.

The reason why its meaning is ingratitude in this context is that mention is made here of the person who witnesses all these favours of Allah in the form of unseen assistance to the dīn from the side of Allah, and thereafter commits "kufr" then such a person is a true transgressor, so normally ingratitude is used when a favour is discussed and not disbelief.

In short, "*Those who are ungrateful after this*" applies to the enemies of the Khulafā', but we have given some concession and have taken "kufr" to mean ingratitude, and if the Shī'ah are not pleased with this concession and insist on taking the meaning of disbelief and thereby regard themselves as true disbelievers, then by all means they may go ahead and do as they please.

Chapter three

The lofty status of the Ṣaḥābah in the light of the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ

At this juncture, it is possible that some of the Shīʿah might present the following argument:

> We accept that the three Khulafā were on the truth and in their respective eras they were the most virtuous, however, when the khilāfah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه arrived then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was the most virtuous and the rightful khalīfah, as per the verse discussed above:
>
> وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ وَ لَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ اَمْنًا ؕ يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا ؕ وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ
>
> *Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth just as He granted it to those before them and that He will surely establish for them [therein] their religion which He has preferred for them and that He will surely substitute for them, after their fear, security, [for] they worship Me, not associating anything with Me. But whoever disbelieves after that - then those are the defiantly disobedient.*[1]
>
> The Ahl al-Sunnah also believe and accept this. Therefore, in this instance, we do not understand how his opponents can also be accepted servants in the court of Allah. We find the Ahl al-Sunnah accepting all of the Ṣaḥābah, whether they opposed ʿAlī رضي الله عنه or not, especially Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رضي الله عنهما. The Ahl al-Sunnah also regard ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها to have been given glad tidings of Jannah.

Thus, it is necessary that the testimony of Allah in favour of the Ṣaḥābah be explained and the misconceptions of the Shīʿah be cleared.

---

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55.

In Sūrah al-Fatḥ, Allah has praised and lauded the Prophet ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah in the following manner:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ ۚ وَ الَّذِيْنَ مَعَهٗۤ اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ ۚ

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their sign is in their faces from the effect of prostration [i.e., prayer].[1]

The crux of this verse is that Muḥammad ﷺ is the Messenger of Allah, his servant and messenger; he is not a magician or fortune-teller. His companions are forceful and firm against the kuffār and are soft and compassionate to each other, you will see them bowing in rukūʿ and prostrating in sajdah. Their objective always is the pleasure of Allah. There are signs on their foreheads due to the effects of their prostration.

The loftiest status after the Prophet ﷺ is that of the Ṣaḥābah, and the status after risālat is that of "*hating for the sake of Allah*"

This was the meaning of the verse, now listen to the explanation of its purport by this unworthy one. Firstly, Allah praised the Prophet ﷺ and thereafter Allah praised the Ṣaḥābah. So, we understand and can conclude from this that the Ṣaḥābah hold the loftiest rank in this Ummah after the Prophet ﷺ.

Similarly, the descriptive quality used in praise of the Prophet ﷺ was risālat, which is the loftiest quality, and thereafter the descriptive quality used when praising the Ṣaḥābah will accordingly be the loftiest quality thereafter. Here we notice that Allah used the word "the Prophet" when describing Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ but when describing the Ṣaḥābah, Allah mentioned:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves.

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

We understand from this that after risālat, the highest status is that of "loving for Allah's pleasure" and "hating for Allah's pleasure", since hating or having enmity towards someone for the sake of Allah is the translation of "*forceful against the disbelievers*" and loving for the sake of Allah is the translation of "*merciful amongst themselves*".

This conforms to the ḥadīth which is found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the crux of which is:

> من أعطى لله ، ومنع لله ، وأحب لله ، وأبغض لله ، وأنكح لله ، فقد استكمل الإيمان
>
> The one who gives for the sake of Allah, who holds back for the sake of Allah, who loves for the sake of Allah, and who hates for the sake of Allah, has perfected his īmān.[1]

It is an absolute fact that the aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah always conform in totality to the Noble Qur'ān, whereas the so-called aḥādīth of the Shīʿah are such that it always contradicts the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān says something and their so-called aḥādīth say the opposite, a few examples of such aḥādīth of theirs has already been given, regarding which the readers are already well aware.

The wisdom of first mentioning the quality of "Hatred for Allah" before the other qualities

Here is a sublime point which needs to be understood, in the ḥadīth we find that "loving for the sake of Allah" is mentioned first and thereafter "hatred for the sake of Allah" but in the Qur'ān we find the words referring to "hatred for the sake of Allah" (i.e. forceful against the disbelievers) mentioned first. What is the underlying wisdom behind this?

What comes to the mind of this person of low understanding, is that "loving for the sake of Allah" and "hating for the sake of Allah" are effects of the love one has for Allah.

In other words, when one's love for Allah has reached perfection then that love now spreads forth and wherever it finds anything which is attached or linked to

1 *Al-Mustadrak ʿalā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn:* 1116

Allah, then according to the degree of attachment it has with Allah, this person also begins to love it.

Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is also loving the beloved

For example, from all humans, the greatest link and attachment to Allah is that of the Prophet ﷺ, so when the person who has complete love for Allah hears about this link of the Prophet ﷺ with Allah, then most definitely he will also begin to love him. Similarly, he will love those people who have an attachment and link with Allah, after the Prophet ﷺ, according to the degree of attachment they have with Allah.

Similarly, the places that have a link and attachment to Allah will be loved by him as well. For example, the Kaʿbah has the greatest link, so he will love the Kaʿbah the most, thereafter the al-Masjid al-Nabawī, and thereafter al-Bayt al-Maqdis. The same will apply to deeds and actions, character and etiquette.

In short, according to the degree of attachment that exists between a certain person or thing and Allah, accordingly, the lovers of Allah will be attached to those persons or things.

Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is actually part of the love one has for the beloved

For example, when it comes to superficial love, we see that when a person loves someone, he also loves the beloved's relatives and well-wishers. In fact, he also begins to love those residing in the same street or alley as the beloved. Just as the amount of sunlight entering a room from the window will be according to the size of the window, similarly the amount of love one has for the entities attached or linked to the beloved will be according to degree of attachment between those entities and the beloved. However, this love is not a separate love, rather it is part of the love one has for the beloved; just like the sunlight entering into the room is part of the sunlight which is out of the room and not a separate or different light.

Having hatred for those who intend evil for the beloved is not a part of loving the beloved but it is the necessary outcome of this love.

On the contrary, the enmity one harbours towards those who intend evil towards the beloved is the necessary outcome of this love, but it is not a part of that love.

In other words, the love one has for the beloved demands that one also hates those who intend evil for the beloved, but this hatred is not an integral part of loving the beloved. In fact, it is not even of the same category. Just like a shadow, when there is some wall or other object blocking the sunlight then we find a shadow being created on the other side. This shadow is not part of the sunlight, in fact it is not even of the same genus as the sunlight, but it is definitely a necessary outcome of the sunlight, on condition that there is a barrier.

Based on the above discussion, we can understand that those who love Allah will most definitely hate those who are the enemies of Allah, but this hatred is not part of their love for Allah, rather it is the necessary outcome of this love for Allah.

The love one has for the *awliyā'* (friends of Allah) is actually part of the love one has for Allah; it is not some separate entity. Therefore, when the Prophet ﷺ praised these qualities of "loving for the sake of Allah" and "hating for the sake of Allah", he mentioned loving for the sake of Allah first and hating for the sake of Allah second, because this is the required sequence.

In the Noble Qur'ān on the other hand, Allah is not praising these two qualities, instead He is praising those who have these two qualities.

When praising someone, the natural order is to begin with the lesser quality, then the greater one and finally the greatest quality

The general practice when praising a person who has different qualities is to begin with the quality which is of a lesser degree, then to mention the one of more importance or significance and thereafter the one which is most important or significant, so that each quality can be valued accordingly. If the most important or most significant quality is mentioned first, one will not value the lesser qualities mentioned thereafter, which are also part of the praiseworthy qualities being mentioned.

Also, worth remembering is that a quality in itself is either good or bad, and the person himself is not good or bad; being good or bad depends on the quality found in him.

If good or evil qualities are being discussed then the most important or most significant quality will be mentioned first but when the good or evil qualities of

a person are being discussed then it will be mentioned in sequence and the order will be reversed (i.e. the lesser quality will be mentioned first).

When the question is about the difference in status between two sets of qualities found in two entities, for example which one has more qualities or which one has less, or which one has better qualities and which one has lesser qualities, then this is in fact discussing and praising the qualities itself, therefore the order used will be the same order used when discussing just the qualities (whereby the most significant will be mentioned first). This is why the Prophet ﷺ was mentioned first and thereafter the Ṣaḥābah (in the verse under discussion).

In short, the first quality mentioned in the verse regarding the Ṣaḥābah is the lesser of their noble qualities enumerated in this verse, namely:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Forceful against the disbelievers

To love is easy, but to hate is difficult, especially when it is one's own relatives

Since loving is easy because one is naturally inclined towards the one who loves him, loving for the sake of Allah cannot be truly gauged. On the contrary, displaying hatred or enmity is difficult, especially since the one whom you have enmity for will in turn have enmity for you and oppose you.

Therefore, hating for the sake of Allah is regarded as a sign of complete īmān, especially when this hatred is for one's relatives, as this is even more difficult.

So, if in general hatred for the sake of Allah is a sign of complete and perfect īmān, then hatred for the sake of Allah when directed to one's own relatives, will be regarded as a sign of extra-complete and absolutely perfect īmān.

When we look at the verses prior to this we come to know that this hatred for the sake of Allah refers to hatred for one's relatives, since the verse before this reads:

لَقَدْ صَدَقَ اللّٰهُ رَسُوْلَهُ الرُّءْيَا بِالْحَقِّ ۚ لَتَدْخُلُنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ اِنْ شَآءَ اللّٰهُ اٰمِنِيْنَ

> *Certainly, has Allah showed to His Messenger the vision [i.e., dream] in truth. You will surely enter al-Masjid al-Ḥarām, if Allah wills, in safety.*[1]

This was revealed to console and comfort the Ṣaḥābah and to remove their grief, and the grief at that point was the grief caused on the occasion of Ḥudaybiyyah.

The Prophet ﷺ returned after signing a treaty with the disbelievers and their hopes of entering the Ḥaram were crushed, leaving their most ardent desire, especially of the Muhājirīn, unfulfilled. The Prophet ﷺ had seen a dream that they were performing Ṭawāf around the Kaʿbah in peace and safety, and they thought it would materialise that very year. As a result, the hearts of the Ṣaḥābah were filled with such joy and happiness as cannot be explained. However, all this happiness and joy was turned into grief and sorrow.

At that moment, the state of the Ṣaḥābah was such that if it were not for their obedience to the Prophet ﷺ, they would have attacked and destroyed all the disbelievers of Makkah, without worrying about relations or considering family ties. The Muhājirīn, who were related to the disbelievers of Makkah, were ready to kill them due to their intense love for Allah and in order to please the Prophet ﷺ.

When the above incident, together with the previous verse and the verse under discussion:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ ۚ وَ الَّذِيْنَ مَعَهٗۤ اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ ۚ

> *Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their sign is in their faces from the effect of prostration [i.e., prayer].*

are read together, then the scenario is created of the Ṣaḥābah having intense anger at every disbeliever, who is an enemy of Allah and the Prophet ﷺ, but this

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 27

verse especially points to their anger against the disbelievers of Makkah on the occasion of Ḥudaybiyyah.

Since the Muhājirīn were the relatives of these disbelievers of Makkah, the words:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Forceful against the disbelievers.

is a sign of their extra-complete absolutely perfect īmān.

Furthermore, when we have understood that the first quality mentioned here is the lowest of their sublime qualities and that the lowest of their qualities in fact points to their extra-complete and absolutely perfect īmān; what can be said about the remaining qualities mentioned thereafter?

Since we are all aware that the mu'minīn with complete īmān are few in number, it is not an easy task for every person to achieve this state of absolute perfection.

The Ṣaḥābah are stern against Shayṭān and their inner selves

Moreover, making mention of the Prophet ﷺ first and the Ṣaḥābah second points out that the Prophet ﷺ holds the first position in the ummah and the Ṣaḥābah the second. So, we can conclude that the Ṣaḥābah are the loftiest of the "*chosen slaves*" to such an extent that Shayṭān can never ever reach them. In fact, since Shayṭān is the chief of the disbelievers and the Ṣaḥābah are:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Forceful against the disbelievers.

so they will be even more stern, firm and severe against Shayṭān. Similarly, the *nafs* (inner-self) is also the enemy of dīn, in fact it is the greatest enemy such that even Shayṭān takes the assistance from the nafs of man because if the nafs does not give in to Shayṭān, he cannot do anything.

In short, the Ṣaḥābah's enmity and sternness will be even more towards Shayṭān and the nafs, since hating the enemies of Allah is proportionate to the enmity these enemies have for Allah; the more their enmity, the more the Ṣaḥābah hate them.

As for other "*chosen slaves*", Shayṭān has no sway over them, but for the Ṣaḥābah there was not even the fear of it happening, since the Ṣaḥābah rendered him helpless. No wonder he would flee from them. Perhaps, this is the reason that Shayṭān used to flee from the shadow of ʿUmar رَضِیَ اللّٰہُ عَنْہُ, because he was a 'fatal poison' for the disbelievers and the quality:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Forceful against the disbelievers.

was prevalent in him more than anyone else. Can Shayṭān ever mislead the one from whom he flees?

In this manner, the necessary outcome is that no difference will come in their *ibādah* (worship), and there will not be any show, insincerity, etc., since these spiritual sicknesses are the result of these two evil forces (Shayṭān and the nafs) and when these two have come under control, what is left to mislead man?

If someone errs due to some misunderstanding, not due to the effects of Shayṭān and the nafs, then too there is hope of him receiving reward

If any wrong action were to be committed, then it will only be due to misunderstanding. Therefore, one should be rewarded on that also. For example: Nabī Mūsā عَلَیْہِ السَّلَام grabbed the hair of Nabī Hārūn عَلَیْہِ السَّلَام in anger, whereas there was no error on the part of Nabī Hārūn عَلَیْہِ السَّلَام. This is definitely not regarded as a crime, and there will be no punishment for such an action, instead there is hope of reward, since the cause for such an action was love of Allah and hating for the sake of Allah, and these two qualities are praiseworthy qualities. In fact, they rank as one of the highest amongst the praiseworthy qualities. On the other hand, we know that the true basis of an action is not determined on its outer form, as then everybody will be rewarded equally for their ṣalāh. We are therefore totally convinced that Nabī Mūsā عَلَیْہِ السَّلَام will be rewarded on his action.

Yes, this is also true that after being informed of the error there was regret. This regret was because of the error, and it does not mean that because there was regret, the action is evil to the extent that it demands punishment.

The reason being that the action in itself might have been wrong, but due to the overpowering good intention it becomes good, just like a slap is regarded as

something bad, but the slap of a friend causes a type of freshness and awakening to a grieved heart, due to it being done out of love.

The disputes amongst the Ṣaḥābah were not due to the effects of Shayṭān and the nafs but due to this same hatred for the sake of Allah

In short, when it has come to light that Shayṭān and the nafs of the Ṣaḥābah were subdued, then if any inappropriate action did take place on their part, in all likelihood it stemmed from misunderstanding. In this instance the action in itself might have been bad but it was not driven by ill-will. Shayṭān and the nafs, which normally has its part in inciting evil, did not have any part in this action coming about. Instead, the power of their īmān was the major factor which caused this to take place. So now because of the overpowering good intention and strength of īmān, the evil of the action was overwhelmed, like a few grams of sugar or salt in a well or a river.

So just as Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ grabbing the hair of his brother was a result of hatred for the sake of Allah, similarly the disputes amongst the Ṣaḥābah were also based upon this same "Hatred for the sake of Allah". However, just as Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ erred by using this "Hatred for the sake of Allah" in an inappropriate place, similarly the Ṣaḥābah erred by exercising this extreme "Hatred for the sake of Allah" and committed an error, as they did not understand the reality of the matter. In such an instance they will not be taken to task, instead they will be rewarded.

Yes, if such an act transpires which is not spurred on by hatred for the sake of Allah or by any other good quality, and instead it is such a thing upon which there can be no reward and it can only be regarded as permissible, then there will not be any reward. However, at the same time they will not be taken to task, on account of it having taken place due to a misunderstanding.

The nafs can be subdued, but its nature cannot change

There also exists this possibility that now and then, very rarely, due to the human instinct, an inappropriate act transpires. The reason for this is that although shayṭān does not have any sway over the "sincere slaves" of Allah and the nafs may also have been subdued and it now obeys him, it is still just like an elephant which hates the human being but has been subdued and overpowered. It may obey the human being but the elephant after all is still an elephant, it did not transform into a human being by the human subduing it, so sometimes it still displays its true nature.

Similarly, the nafs although subdued and overpowered due to firm īmān and intense love for Allah, after all it is still the nafs and naturally incites one towards evil and vice.

The basis of good is the rūḥ and the basis of evil is the nafs

Let us explain this in detail, when we find in the body the four different conditions: i.e. heat, cold, wetness and dryness, we learn that the body is made up of the root or basis of those four conditions, i.e. fire, air, water and sand. Similarly, when we see that the human is sometimes inclined towards good and sometimes inclined towards evil, we understand that the human is made up of the root or basis of these two conditions.

However, as in the case of the four elements, each element has its own special condition, the condition of another element is not found in this element, and if it has to be found then it would only be temporary, like water which gets hot. Similarly, with regards to the basis or root of good and evil, each one has its own condition, and if one is found in the other then it is only temporary.

Once we have accepted this, now let us explain further:

The root of good is the *rūḥ* (soul) and the root of evil is the nafs. The rūḥ in itself is the root of good and if it is overpowered such that evil emits from it, then it will be said to be a temporary state. The nafs on the other hand is in itself the root of evil and if it gets overpowered such that good emits from it, then it will also be regarded to be a temporary state.

The rūḥ is an entity from the realm of angles and the nafs is from the circle of the devil

Going further, from the heat in the body we come to know of a 'piece of fire' found in the body, and we say that the root of this fire is the 'region of fire'. Allah, through His unlimited power, has brought the 'piece of fire' from its origin and placed it within the body of the human being. Similarly, when we see the inclination to do good, firstly we understand that there is something within the human which is the basis or root of this good, thereafter we understand that it has its roots in the circles of the *Malā'ikah* (angels), regarding whom Allah has declared:

لَّا يَعْصُوْنَ اللّٰهَ مَآ اَمَرَهُمْ وَ يَفْعَلُوْنَ مَا يُؤْمَرُوْنَ

They do not disobey Allah in what He commands them but do what they are commanded.[1]

The gist of this is that their speciality is doing good.

Furthermore, when we see a person inclined to evil, we firstly understand that there is within him a 'piece' of something which is specifically for evil, thereafter we figure out that the root of this 'piece' is from the circle of Shayāṭīn, regarding whom Allah says:

وَكَانَ الشَّيْطٰنُ لِرَبِّهٖ كَفُوْرًا

And ever has Satan been to his Lord ungrateful.[2]

The gist of this is that Shayṭān was always disobedient to Allah, which means that Shayṭān's specific quality is evil and disobedience.

In short, the rūḥ is something from the realm of malā'ikah and the nafs is from the circle of Shayāṭīn, and Allah has through His unlimited power gathered the two in one place, just like how a parrot and a crow are placed in one cage.

The various stages of good or evil through which the human passes are due to the effect of the angels or shayṭān

Just as in the human body the four elements gain strength from its origin, similarly the rūḥ and nafs also gain strength from its origin, i.e. the Malā'ikah and the Shayāṭīn. This is also borne out by certain aḥādīth. Logic also dictates that on different occasions, when either good or bad is dominant, it is either the effect of the Malā'ikah or of the Shayāṭīn, because if this were not the case then only the natural inclination of man would have remained.

In short, if the natural condition goes away, then it goes away due to some outer force, so the inclination to do good can only be attributed to the assistance of the Malā'ikah and inclination to evil can only be from the effect of the Shayāṭīn.

---

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 6.

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 27.

When the nafs is brought under control then the level of "Forceful against the disbelievers" is attained

In light of this, if at any time the desire to do good becomes dominant and as a result one becomes absorbed in carrying out good deeds, resulting in the effects of the rūḥ rubbing off on to the nafs, just as when a fire is lit beneath a pot of water whereby the heat of the fire warms the water and removes its inherent quality of coolness. Here too the rūḥ assists the inner-self in the same manner and just as the water (after heating) is able to carry out the same task as the fire, so too here will the nafs be able to act in the same manner as the rūḥ. Thus, when the rūḥ is dominant then the nafs is controlled and one attains the level of "*Forceful against the disbelievers*, wherein Shayṭān no longer has any grip upon a person. In this event the same control which he once had no longer remains.

When the nafs is controlled then too do not trust

However, just as we have no choice and control over another, such as in the case with a slave or servant whereby we can only instruct them to carry out a task but not will them to do it, and it is by their choice that they carry it out; so too Shayṭān desists from whispering to the nafs. Nevertheless, when the nafs is brought under control or suppressed it becomes submissive to the rūḥ. However, the nafs is after all the nafs, and just as water is still water regardless of how hot it may be, such that the hot water is still able to extinguish the fire in the same way as cold water, and the heat of the water too is temporary such that if the fire is extinguished or the pot removed from the fire then the water will immediately begin to cool; in the same manner, if the nafs is neglected for even a moment, it will return to its normal state.

A person can never remain in one state

It is impossible to remain in one state, especially such a creation regarding whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has said:

وَ لَقَدْ عَهِدْنَآ اِلٰی اٰدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِیَ وَ لَمْ نَجِدْ لَه عَزْمًا

And We had already taken a promise from Adam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.[1]

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115

Since these qualities were found in Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, it will be found in varying quantities in all human beings. The reason for this is that in procreation certain qualities of the essence still remain. In human beings there is essence of human being; in horses there is the essence of horses and in donkeys there is the essence of donkeys and so on. When the essential quality remains then all those that will be the siblings created from it will have the same qualities like that of the source. Therefore, all qualities of Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ will be found in varying quantities in all human beings. As the saying goes:

A child reflects the qualities of his father.

So, if all human beings cannot remain in one state then at times one might slip in guarding the nafs and it may begin to incline towards its natural state, resulting in some error or the other being committed.

As far as the thought of changing the reality of the nafs to act permanently as the rūḥ, this is impossible. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

لَا تَبْدِيْلَ لِخَلْقِ اللّٰهِ

There can be no change to Allah's creation.[1]

There is a vast difference between those sins committed when overpowered by the nafs and those committed when the nafs has been overpowered

In essence, one can never be free from forgetfulness or error but the sin committed in this case is not equal to the sin committed when the nafs is dominant and the rūḥ has no effect on it, and instead the nafs affects the rūḥ. The reason for this difference is that one was not deficient in any way as he is only required to make his rūḥ dominant and suppress his nafs. It is not his duty or in his capacity to transform the nafs into the rūḥ (such that it only commands him to do good), since this is beyond his capacity. When a person has done all in his capability, is he not worthy of forgiveness? Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى himself says:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللّٰهُ نَفْسًا اِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 30

Allah does not charge a soul except [with that within] its capacity.[1]

Therefore, we have firm belief and conviction that in this case when one perpetrates sin in error, even though it is still a sin, Allah through His all-encompassing mercy and the afore-mentioned promise will forgive him.

It is possible that the errors in judgement committed by the Ambiyā' are of this category, for which they were reprimanded, or it may fall under the category- *Ḥasanāt al-Abrār Sayyi'āt al-Muqarrabīn*, in other words what may be conspired to be commendable for the layman is deemed inappropriate for the close servants of Allah.

Those who are stern against the disbelievers may err but Shayṭān cannot gain control over them

At this juncture, I wish to highlight that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى praised the Ṣaḥābah with this description, that they are:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves.

and then too with such qualities that it ranks immediately after risālat. These qualities by no means indicate that they cannot commit any sin or error. It will only be impossible if those described to possess this quality were capable of changing the reality of the nafs. It is also evident that those who possess this quality cannot remain in one state, and how is it possible for them to remain in one state when they possess in themselves two opposing states which are literally enemies of each other? It suffices for them that Shayṭān cannot gain control over them and Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى will remove evil and vice from their path. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى mentioned this to be the reason for removing evil and vice from Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ, namely that he was a chosen servant of Allah.

كَذٰلِكَ لِنَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ السُّوْٓءَ وَالْفَحْشَآءَ ۚ اِنَّه مِنْ عِبَادِنَا الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ

And thus [it was] that We should avert from him evil and immorality. Indeed, he was of Our chosen servants [2]

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 286.

2 Sūrah Yūsuf: 24

Thus, it is not necessary that those who are described as severe and stern against the disbelievers and compassionate amongst themselves, should not and cannot have any faults.

The quality of being forceful against the kuffār and compassionate amongst each other, necessitates sincerity and negates the possibility of boastfulness

At the same time, it is necessary that they not be lethargic in performing ibādah and boastfulness should have no place in their actions. If he seeks anything from his ibādah then he seeks the pleasure of Allah, if his gaze is upon anything it is the virtues of Allah. This is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ followed mention of these two qualities (Forceful against the disbelievers and compassionate amongst each other) with another two qualities:

تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۡ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ

You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their sign is in their faces from the effect of prostration [i.e., prayer].

Even the most honourable at times can regard good to be evil due to misinterpretation

After having understood the above explanation, I wish to enlighten the Shīʿah scholars that many a time even the most honourable and high ranking can misinterpret a good action to be evil. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ who was the Nabī of his time misinterpreted the action of Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ damaging the boat to be wrong.

He understood this to be opposing the Sharīʿah, so much so that he condemned him by saying:

لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا اِمْرًا

You have certainly done a grave thing.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 71.

This was despite the fact that Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did nothing wrong, in fact he did something commendable. If he had not broken the boat, then it would have been seized by the king.

In the same manner, if some Shīʿah scholars have misinterpreted the actions of a few of the Ṣaḥābah, for example the issue of not giving the land of Fadak, or any other action for that matter, and regard it to be wrong, even though in reality it was not, then it would not be something unperceivable.

If one were to say that Khiḍr صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was under divine inspiration and therefore it would make sense for others not to understand him, whereas Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was not under any divine inspiration, then we say that this line of thinking is also incorrect. We would like to remind you of the anger of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ at his brother, Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, and the manner in which he grabbed hold of his head and beard, which he did because he was not aware of the actual events that had transpired. So, if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا too had not been aware of the actual events, what harm is there? In this even there is no question of divine inspiration and Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ committed no error. If the Shīʿah insist that such an error from her is impossible on account of her being infallible then it should be noted that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا is only considered to be infallible by the Shīʿah, whereas Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is regarded as such by both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah.

If you do not accept this as well then, this unworthy one has clarified in the preceding pages that the pious and sincere servants of Allah at times can err, and these errors in no way negates their piety. Piety is one matter and committing a sin is something else altogether.

The sin which would negate the *wilāyah* (sainthood) of a person would be such a sin committed while the nafs remains dominant and the rūḥ subservient to it, and not an act committed by human error. This is why we cannot say regarding what has been mentioned regarding Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

وَ عَصٰى اٰدَمُ رَبَّه فَغَوٰى

And Adam disobeyed his Lord and erred.[1]

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 121.

Or in relation to Nabī Yūnus عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, Allah said:

فَاصْبِرْ لِحُكْمِ رَبِّكَ وَ لَا تَكُنْ كَصَاحِبِ الْحُوْتِ

Then be patient for the decision of your Lord, [O Muḥammad], and be not like the companion of the fish [i.e., Jonah] when he called out while he was distressed.[1]

And even in relation to the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ لَهٗ اَسْرٰى حَتّٰى يُثْخِنَ فِى الْاَرْضِ

It is not for a prophet to have captives [of war] until he inflicts a massacre [upon Allah's enemies] in the land.[2]

What will the meaning of all these verses be? More so when they are all mentioned in the Book of Allah, thus there is no possibility of denying them as well. On the other hand, the errors of the Ṣaḥābah, if they are even regarded as errors and not misunderstandings, then too it has not been mentioned in the Qur'ān nor in the mutawātir aḥādīth of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, making it possible that these reports are incorrect and not at all authentic. Yet I will say that they are not incorrect but whatever response you give in the defence of the Ambiyā', understand the same for the Ṣaḥābah. In fact, they are more excused as they were not infallible and they were not Ambiyā', yet Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى praised them so glowingly, so what reply is still required and what excuse needs to be given?

Such praise despite the possibility of error indicates Allah's forgiveness and pleasure

In essence, such errors are not blameworthy and no sane person will ever accept that they will be taken to task or punished for it. We have already hinted that the mention of these qualities:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves.

1 Sūrah al-Qalam: 48

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 67.

does not necessitate that they never commit any error. Thus, when this is not a necessity and yet Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has praised them, it indicates that these qualities are such that on account of it, they will not be taken to task for the errors they commit but rather they will be eclipsed by the beauty of this trait. In other words, this verse subtly hints towards their forgiveness, as praising a pig or even filth would be better than praising any dweller of Jahannam.

However, a discerning mind is required, how is it possible for the Ṣaḥābah to be destined for Jahannam when they have been praised in such a manner? In this instance, one can ascribe a thousand sins to them, it will not harm them but instead it will destroy the future of the one who ascribes it to them.

Such praise despite the possibility of error is a slap in the face of their enemies

When a wise king who is concerned about the rule of his country and aware of the affairs of his subjects does not admonish a few of his governors for the errors they commit then it is a sign that he loves them dearly. On the other hand, if the king were to rather praise them (even though they may have erred) and show enmity to their enemies and enumerate their virtues to such an extent that the king announces that whoever possesses the same qualities as they do will be forgiven by me and in fact rewarded, then their will remain no other conclusion except that the king loves them dearly and he loves those who love them and he is the enemy of those who hate them.

One objective of praising the Ṣaḥābah is to offend their future enemies

By the grace of Allah, all of this can be understood by studying these verses. It begins with such praise for the Ṣaḥābah that there can be no higher praise for any other in this ummah and thereafter Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى says:

لِيَغِيظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ ؕ

So that He [i.e., Allah] may enrage by them the disbelievers.

In other words, whatever has been said above in praise of the Ṣaḥābah has been said to offend and anger the disbelievers, i.e. their enemies.

Subḥān Allāh, Allah's knowledge is so vast that he has indicated to what is still to transpire. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى knew already that the Shīʿah, Nawāṣib, and Khawārij would show insolence towards the Ṣaḥābah and have no regard for their standing in the sight of Allah.

As far as the necessity for the words "أعداءهم" (*their enemies*) needing to be mentioned after the words "ليغيظ بهم" (to enrage, making the meaning: "*So that their enemies may be enraged by them*"); the reason why the word "kuffār" was mentioned is to indicate that only the disbelievers can do such a thing. A believer can never have enmity for such people, who have been praised by Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى and for whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has announced his pleasure.

The Shīʿah are indebted to the Ṣaḥābah as well

In other words, those enemies of the Ṣaḥābah who have had the good fortune of reciting the *kalimah* (testimony of faith) and consider themselves to be Muslims, they too are indebted to the sacrifices of the Ṣaḥābah. If the Ṣaḥābah had not made jihād then Islam would not have spread and the Qur'ān would not have been recited as it is, such that even the Shīʿah (despite the condition of their recitation) are also able to benefit somewhat from it. With this in mind, if one is not grateful to the Ṣaḥābah then who will gratitude be shown to and if disrespect is still shown towards them then who will they show respect to? Who can be a greater denier of the bounty of Allah than them? This is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has referred to the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah as kuffār.

Enumerating the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in the Qur'ān foretells the coming of those who will bear enmity for them

Since Allah knew through his infinite knowledge that there will be people who will speak ill of the Ṣaḥābah as has been explained above, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى also said:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ مِنْهُمْ مَّغْفِرَةً وَّ اَجْرًا عَظِيْمًا

Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

In other words:

> O you who deny the Ṣaḥābah! This group of Ṣaḥābah whom we have praised and regarding whom you do not desist speaking ill of, even if by chance they happen to be as you describe and did truly commit these errors then too what of it? I have promised that whoever amongst them has īmān and does good deeds, I will forgive his sins and grant him a most gracious reward. When they are stern against the disbelievers and compassionate amongst each other, always engaged in ṣalāh, seeking nothing else but the pleasure of Allah, then why should I not forgive their sins and why should I not reward them for their īmān and righteous deeds? What greater form of īmān and righteous deeds are there than this?

Promise of forgiveness and reward was unconditional

If it had been stated that in order to attain forgiveness and this gracious reward there is one condition and that is you should not commit any sin whatsoever, then perhaps the Shīʿah might have had a leg to stand on, but there is no such condition mentioned here. Those with understanding know full-well that the word "منهم" (*from amongst them*) that comes after the word "عملوا الصالحات" (*who do good deeds*) was only mentioned as a response to those who deny (the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah). If one were to assume that some of them did indeed have īmān and performed righteous deeds while others amongst them still remained firm on disbelief, Allah forbid, then we know that the Shīʿah will not raise any objections after this verse, because they too know full well that it is impossible to call a person a disbeliever after Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has called him a believer. Thus, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has first testified to their īmān and performance of righteous deeds and in fact here Allah testified to them having the highest level of īmān and them performing the best of actions, as there can be no greater īmān that would warrant Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ declaring enmity with all those who bear enmity towards them and announcing friendship with all those who hold them dear.

The meaning of īmān and the levels of conviction

The reason for the conclusion made above is extremely clear. Since īmān means to believe in something after attaining conviction, the technical definition of īmān in Sharīʿah is to have complete conviction in the perfection of Allah and then submit to Him. For example, Allah is *Aḥkam al-Ḥākimīn* (The Wisest of those who decree),

so īmān will first necessitate that one believes that Allah possesses this quality in absolute perfection and then submit to Him. Furthermore, submitting means that you do not go against the laws in anyway. The same applies to all the attributes of Allah.

The different levels of conviction

However, there are different levels of conviction:

ʿ***Ilm al-Yaqīn:*** This is the lowest level of conviction. An example of this is when a reliable person tells us about the existence of something in a specific place. This level of conviction is attained by every Muslim because the Prophet ﷺ, who is without a doubt truthful, has informed us of the perfect attributes of Allah. If a person does not have at least this level of conviction, then he does not have īmān.

ʿ***Ayn al-Yaqīn:*** This is the second level of conviction. This is the conviction attained when one sees with his naked eye what he had heard previously. This kind of conviction is higher than the first because hearing about something is not the same as seeing it for yourself. This is the reason why people do not fall in love with a person on mere mention of their beauty whereas the love which fills the heart after gazing at that beauty is obvious and needs no explanation. All know the stories of Laylā, Shirīn, and even Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام but the tales of their beauty, despite being incredibly astonishing, does not cause one to swoon in a frenzy of love. Such that even after hearing of the beauty of Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, no one fell in love with him, but the moment the women saw him, they were mesmerised by his beauty. The reason for this is that merely hearing about something does not create love, as then Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was after all Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.

Whatever is heard will only be understood in terms of what one has seen. For example, whenever a person sees something beautiful then he experiences a feeling of elation in his heart; now when he hears from another that a certain person is beautiful, he compares it to his previous experience and this creates desire to see the described person. If one does not have something to compare it to then mere words would do nothing for him. This is why a person born blind, who has never seen beauty and cannot differentiate between beautiful and grotesque, will never love a person for their looks (and descriptions of their beauty will have no meaning to him).

Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn: This is the final level of conviction and is attained when a person makes use of what he has seen with his eye. For example, a person sees water and thereafter drinks it; after drinking it he is convinced that it is water and all doubts that it could possibly be urine or anything else besides water are all removed.

This level of conviction is higher than ʿAyn al-Yaqīn and the love that was created by merely looking is increased tenfold.

Love is only created after Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn

In reality, love is only created in this level (Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn) because the love one has for water is only because it quenches the thirst, which was only learnt from drinking it. If for example there were to be a person who never heard of water before, nor saw it or ever drank it, and never experienced a need for it but suddenly he becomes thirsty and water is placed before him; how will he know the effects of that water and that it will quench his thirst? If Allah does not inspire his heart to drink the water or someone does not inform him of its effects, then his mind will never consider drinking it.

Looking at the beauty of a person creates love because of the similitude to gazing at a beautiful flower, which brings peace to the soul, so too does gazing at the beauty of another do the same. In essence, logic dictates that love is attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is evident. If I had not feared this discussion becoming excessively lengthy, I would have elaborated further on this point but with my full schedule and little time, I cannot do so and then too the reply to the letter is required quickly, therefore I will suffice with whatever has been said.

The Ṣaḥābah attained the level of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and hating for the pleasure of Allah and loving for the pleasure of Allah was rooted in their hearts

In essence, love is attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and this is the highest level of conviction. Thereafter the highest level of love is to love all those associated with the beloved and furthermore hate the enemies of the beloved. Thus, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ testified that the Ṣaḥābah have hatred for the enemies of Allah and love for the friends of Allah, which establishes that they have the highest level of love for Allah.

One might say that it is not necessary that loving a Muslim is only for the sake of Allah as there are many reasons for love. One might love another on account of family relation or perhaps because of kindness or even friendship, as well as many other countless reasons. Similarly, there are many reasons for hating another. So as long as it cannot be proven that this love or hate was for the sake of Allah, your claim cannot be established.

The first answer to this is that whenever love, or hatred for that matter, is attached to a particular quality then the love or hatred is always understood to be on account of that quality. For example, if someone says: "I love good people" or "I love educated people" or even if he were to say "I hate arrogant people" or "I hate the disbelievers", then even the unjust would not misunderstand the reason for this love or hatred. It would be impossible for any person to still doubt the reason for his hatred and love. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ also said:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Forceful against the disbelievers merciful among themselves.

In this verse, Allah said that the Ṣaḥābah are stern against the kuffār and the meaning of kāfir is that he is an open enemy to Allah. This makes it clear that their hatred for them is on account of their kufr and no other reason. Therefore, if their hatred is on account of kufr then their love is also for the sake of Allah. This is the purpose of:

رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Merciful among themselves.

In other words, the compassion they have for each other is on account of them being in the company of the Prophet صَلَّىٰٓاللَّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ and in his service; the gist of which is that they are all the beloveds of Allah and thus their compassion for each other will also be for the sake of Allah.

The purpose of the Ṣaḥābah was only to gain the pleasure of Allah

In addition to the above, the statement:

يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫

Seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure.

has beautifully established the reality of their actions that whatever they do they do solely for the sake of Allah. Therefore, hatred for the kuffār and mutual love and compassion for the mu'minīn was all for the sake of Allah, and seeking Allah's pleasure is the greatest sign of love for Allah. There is no other reason for seeking the pleasure of Allah except love for Allah. The majority of people who exert themselves in fulfilling virtuous deeds do so more in search of Jannah than in seeking Allah's pleasure, just as one who is poverty-stricken endeavours to please the affluent in search of a slice of bread. His purpose is not to seek the pleasure of the wealthy man but rather only desires a morsel to eat. Thus, truly seeking the pleasure of another is an act which can only be carried out by one filled with love for that person. In that light the hatred the Ṣaḥābah bore for the disbelievers and the love they had for each other were all products of the love they had for Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى.

The love and submission of the Ṣaḥābah was of the highest level

Since love is only attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is the highest form of conviction. The conviction which the Ṣaḥābah had in the Majesty, Might, Grandeur, Perfection and Beauty of Allah was of the highest, after which there is no greater conviction. Their submission was of such level that its signs were plainly visible, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى says:

تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا

You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer].

If they had not submitted, then why would they do these actions? These words together with:

يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ

Seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their sign is in their faces from the effect of prostration [i.e., prayer].

All these qualities inform us of their righteous deeds. Thus, their īmān is proven to be most perfect and their actions for which they were promised forgiveness and a gracious reward proven to be the best actions.

As for the claim that in the company of the Prophet ﷺ there were some who were true believers and others who were not, which is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ added the words "منهم" (from amongst them, indicating that this promise is not for all of the Ṣaḥābah), this is such a claim which only a Shīʿah can make, because if denying the obvious and accepting the impossible was truly prohibited in their religion then no Shīʿah would turn away from the Ahl al-Sunnah and adhere to Shīʿism. If I had not feared that the discussion will be prolonged, I would have mentioned more proofs to support my claim but if those with intellect were to understand this one point then it is sufficient.

Varying stages of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn

If someone were to argue that if the Ṣaḥābah had Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is the highest form of conviction, then what level have you left for the Prophet ﷺ? You might as well call them prophets as well, why even refer to them as Ṣaḥābah?

The reply to this misconception is that if a person hears something from a hundred people and is convinced by them, this conviction is still termed ʿIlm al-Yaqīn. Even if he were to hear it from a thousand people then too it will still be regarded as ʿIlm al-Yaqīn even though in the second instance (when hearing from a thousand people) the conviction will be greater.

Similarly, if someone sees something from a distance, he still gains ʿAyn al-Yaqīn and if he sees it a foot away from him, he will also still have only attained ʿAyn al-Yaqīn but obviously the clarity in the second instance (seeing it up close) will not be equal to the first.

In the same manner, when a person drinks a little water he gains Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and if he drinks it a few times he has still attained Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn. However, the conviction in the second instance is greater than the former. Many a time, by doing something once one will not attain complete familiarity of it but after doing it repeatedly, he will attain complete knowledge and familiarity of it.

It is not necessary that all people who have attained Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn should be equal.

Levels vary from person to person; many a time two people may look simultaneously at one beautiful thing but one might have love for that thing while the other not. If they both love the same person then their love will not be the same. Therefore, the love the Ṣaḥābah had for Allah did not surpass the love the Prophet ﷺ had for Allah.

Differences of opinion does not contradict having compassion for each other

One point remains to be discussed, it is possible that some Shīʿah might say, in a desperate attempt to deny the piety of the Ṣaḥābah:

Since the Ṣaḥābah had grievous disputes with each other (which are related in the books of the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah) how can we say that they were compassionate amongst each other? The fact that they had disputes with each other on its own proves that they had no compassion for each other, so how can we conclude that they had complete and perfect īmān? What we can conclude is that those who hurt and fought against Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه are not included amongst those described by:

رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Merciful among themselves.

and furthermore, they are not those described by the words:

اَلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ

Those who believe and do righteous deeds.

In fact, the words "منهم" (from amongst them) which appears after has been mentioned specifically to exclude them.

The reply to this form of argument is in actual fact not our responsibility because this very argument can be brought by the Khawārij and Nawāṣib against the Shīʿah, so they too will have to respond.

Nevertheless, to console both the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah we will reply.

The disputes of the Ṣaḥābah were also on account of their compassion for each other

Distress can be caused by two things:

Animosity

Love

The distress which arises on account of animosity is evident and is the same anguish and distress a person experiences from his enemy.

As for the distress one experiences on account of love: this is when a person acts contrary to the desires of his friend, the distress or anguish one feels in this instance is because of love. If a stranger were to have made such remarks then it would not have hurt, which makes it clear that the cause of this distress is love. If this love had not existed, then there would have been no distress. If this can be understood in light of the Ṣaḥābah then much has been understood and the words of the Qur'ān will have to be accepted.

We seek Allah's protection, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is not deceptive and a liar similar to the likes of Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Aḥwal (Shayṭān al-Ṭāq), etc who were labelled as liars by the 'infallible' Imāms and the books of the Shīʿah (which will be discussed shortly). Those who have become accustomed to accepting such implausible narrations from such deceptive narrators, why will they ever accept the truth, even if it is spoken by the All-Truthful Allah?

The credibility of the narrators upon whose narrations Shīʿism is founded

Furthermore, according to the Shīʿah, the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah cannot be relied upon, but we would like to ask them about the condition of their narrators upon which their dīn is based and who are the link to their 'infallible' Imāms. Their conditions are such that the likes of Hishām ibn Sālim, al-Maythamī, al-Aḥwal al-Ṭāq, etc, who are the leaders, fore-runners and chief narrators of the Shīʿah; cannot be discussed completely in this brief treatise. However, as a way of example I will make mention of a few of these reports.

Al-Kulaynī reports in *al-Kāfī*:

عن ابراهيم محمد بن الخزار و محمد بن الحسين قالا دخلنا على ابى الحسين الرضا عليه السلام فقلنا ان هشام بن السالم و الميثمى و الصاحب الطاق يقولون ان الله تعالى اجوف الى السرة و الباقى صمد فخر لله ساجدا ثم قال سبحانك ما عرفوك و لا وحدوك فمن اجل ذلك وصفوك

Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Khazzār and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn both narrate: "We entered upon Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Riḍā رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and we mentioned to him that Hishām bin Sālim, al-Maythamī and Ṣāhib al-Ṭāq are saying that verily Allah is hollow up to the navel, and the rest is solid." On hearing this, Imām Riḍā رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ fell into prostration and supplicated: "Subḥān Allāh! They neither know You nor do they profess your Oneness; this is the reason why they describe You (in this manner)."

The second narration has also been narrated by al-Kulaynī.

عن على بن حمزة قال قلت لابى عبد الله عليه السلام سمعت هشام بن الحكم يروى عنكم ان الله جسم صمدى نورى معرفته ضرورة يمن بها على من يشاء من خلقه فقال عليه السلام سبحان من لا يعلم احد كيف ليس كمثله شىء و هو السميع البصير

ʿAlī ibn Ḥamzah narrates that he said to Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ: "I heard Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam reporting on your authority that Allah is a heavy strong body of celestial light, whose recognition is incumbent, which he grants to whomsoever He wishes." Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ replied: "Glory be to that Being whose form is not known to anyone. There is nothing like Him. He is All-Hearing, All-Seeing."

Just marvel at these narrations, the knowledge which these fore-runners of the Shīʿah have ascribed to the illustrious Imāms. In fact, some of these leaders, such as Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Bakr bin Aʿyun, Sulaymān Jaʿfarī, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, etc, believed that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is ignorant of the future. To what extent should I continue discussing their false beliefs? Such are the people who transmit crucial matters of dīn for the Shīʿah and it is their narrations that they consider authentic. It is their fictitious tales which they gather in their books and then dubbed them with the title of *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic books), which are then accepted by all their scholars.

Even if the Shīʿī scholars, out of habit (for falsehood), happen to refute these narrations when in the presence of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, they still believe in them firmly with their hearts.

All praise belongs to Allah! It is only the Ahl al-Sunnah that when they say *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic books) then be assured that those books comprise only of those narrations transmitted by reliable, credible and pious individuals. If any narrations have been transmitted from unreliable sources, then it was only to show the defects of those narrations so that people will be saved from being deceived by it, which is why they state thereafter that this narration is weak and that one is fabricated.

The crux of the matter is when this is the state of the fundamental narrations of the Shīʿī faith then what need be said of the historical accounts (which are lesser in credibility). The narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah have already been deemed unreliable (by the Shīʿah) so why then will those narrations reported about the disagreements of the Ṣaḥābah have any relevance against what has been stated in the Qur'ān? At the end of the day, it is the Qur'ān that is mutawātir.

Thus, when the Qur'ān says that they were "*Merciful amongst each other*" and according to your understanding (i.e. the Shīʿah), this means that they had absolutely no disagreements with each other whatsoever, then in accordance with the principle that all those narrations which contradict the Qur'ān are rejected; all those narrations which mention some disagreement between them will be deemed unreliable.

By the grace of Allah, after all necessary aspects of this verse have been discussed, it is incumbent upon us to present such a verse which testifies to the piety of the Ṣaḥābah, as clear as daylight, which can be easily understood and will also indicate their end being upon virtue. Therefore, we present the sixth verse before you:

وَالسّٰبِقُوْنَ الْاَوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهٰجِرِيْنَ وَالْاَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِيْنَ اتَّبَعُوْهُمْ بِاِحْسَانٍ ۙ
رَّضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوْا عَنْهُ وَاَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنّٰتٍ تَجْرِيْ تَحْتَهَا الْاَنْهٰرُ خٰلِدِيْنَ
فِيْهَآ اَبَدًا ؕ ذٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيْمُ

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājireen and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are

pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.[1]

After this verse, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī truly seeks the truth then he will have no delay in doing so. Even one who has been indoctrinated for years with Shīʿī beliefs will discover the truth after reading this verse. Why should they not accept the truth when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ in his infinite wisdom left no avenue or doorway in this verse for those who argue against the Ṣaḥābah.

The reason for Allah's pleasure in this verse rests only upon Hijrah

If īmān or the performance of righteous deeds were mentioned to be the reason for attaining Allah's pleasure then perhaps the Shīʿah, Khawārij and Nawāṣib could have said that this promise is only for those who have īmān and do righteous deeds and they did not have īmān. The first three Khulafā', Zubayr, Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and others being amongst the fore-runners of the Muhājirīn is nothing unknown that can be possibly denied or said to be a fabrication. More so for the first khalīfah, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as his hijrah even precedes that of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he is regarded as the first of the fore-runners of the Muhājirīn. In this instance, this verse will point to his superiority because all the promises mentioned in this verse are on account of hijrah, so accordingly he who surpassed others in hijrah will also surpass others in deserving this promise being fulfilled for him. It is well-known that when the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left his home to perform hijrah, he first came to the house of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and they left together. All others only left after them.

The difference between hijrah to Abyssinia and hijrah to Madīnah

Even though the hijrah to Abyssinia took place before the hijrah to Madīnah, it does not surpass the hijrah to Madīnah. The permissibility of migrating to Abyssinia was only on account of inability to endure the severe hardships being inflicted upon the Muslims. It had become very difficult to remain steadfast on dīn in Makkah and therefore the weak were permitted to migrate in order to preserve their īmān and lives. This is why the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not permitted to migrate to Abyssinia, and even if someone were to present some far-fetched reason for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not being ordered to migrate, they will have no answer as to why those who did not migrate to Abyssinia were not rebuked.

---

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.

On the other hand, the objective of migrating to Madīnah was for the sake of supporting and strengthening dīn, thus migrating to Madīnah cannot be termed to be a concession but was rather a strict order. This is why those who failed to migrate were severely reprimanded. The migration to Abyssinia being a concession and the migration to Madīnah being an instruction, aside from being common knowledge, is even clearer after this explanation. However, to further elaborate my point the difference between the two is understood from the fact that migrating to Madīnah was in effect taking a gamble with one's life whereas migrating to Abyssinia was to save one's life. Migration to Madīnah was to strengthen the dīn whereas migrating to Abyssinia was so one could perform his ṣalāh and ṣawm in peace. Migration to Madīnah was to support the Prophet ﷺ whereas the migration to Abyssinia left him alone in Makkah. In the case of migrating to Madīnah they were beaten, killed and had to fight against their own leaders and family, whereas when migrating to Abyssinia they saved themselves from the hands of the enemy and could live in peace. Thus, the migration to Abyssinia is not worthy of praise and more so not the praise of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

The verse refers only to the migration to Madīnah

This is the reason why neither of the two groups consider this verse to refer to the migration to Abyssinia nor did they regard it to be expounding its virtues. The reason for this apparently is that this verse as well as others like it were all revealed after the hijrah to Madīnah and these verses in addition to mentioning the virtues of the Muhājirīn also mention the virtues of the Anṣār. In Sūrah Ḥashr, the words:

يَنْصُرُوْنَ اللّٰه

Supporting [the cause of] Allah.[1]

also appear which indicate that these virtues pertain to the assistance and aid the Anṣār rendered to the Muhājirīn when they migrated towards them. If there was a hijrah that fits this description, then it is only the hijrah to Madīnah. In the hijrah to Abyssinia there were no Anṣār nor was there any aid to speak of. Nevertheless, the precedence of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and others is something undeniable.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8.

This verse does not make known the pleasure of Allah but also the highest level of īmān and good deeds

On account of this precedence in hijrah, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى says that He is pleased with them. This in itself is sufficient praise as there is nothing greater than attaining the pleasure of Allah. If Allah is pleased with a person then one can safely conclude that they have the highest form of īmān, which cannot be described and their actions too of the highest calibre. Thus, it will corroborate entirely with the verse mentioned previously:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ مِنْهُمْ مَّغْفِرَةً وَّ اَجْرًا عَظِيْمًا

Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.[1]

This leaves no room to doubt them ever being forgiven because the revered personalities mentioned above were all with the Prophet صَلَّىاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ at Ḥudaybiyyah (where this verse was revealed).

Continuous glad tidings of Jannah can only indicate one's end being good

In addition to this, Allah stated that gardens of Jannah have been prepared for them wherein they will remain forever. If any person were to now doubt their piety, it can only mean that according to him piety means that Allah is displeased with a person and has prepared the fire of Jahannam for him. So those Shīʿah, who speak ill against these noble personalities and instead regard their enemies to be pious, possibly do so on account of this definition of piety. However, in this instance it would necessitate that they absolve themselves from Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ as well, since he is also amongst those who were given these glad tidings. What can be said about those who speak ill of these friends of Allah, who belie Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى as well; calling them (the Ṣaḥābah) sinners and kāfir? This only results in them labelling themselves as sinners and disbelievers.

One who claims the sun has no light

Does not testify against the sun but his own lack of sight.

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

Whichever objections the Shīʿah raise against the Ṣaḥābah can be raised by the Khawārij against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

I wish to also add to the above, it is possible that some prejudiced individual might say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was pleased with the Ṣaḥābah at first but then became angry with them because of their opposition to the khilāfah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the fact that Jannah had been prepared for them does not necessitate that they will not be punished. In fact, it is quite possible that they will be punished first and only thereafter enter Jannah.

In reality such an assertion needs no reply, especially when this question is raised by the Shīʿah, because these same doubts may be raised by the Khawārij against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ such that they may also claim that the promise of forgiveness refers to the forgiveness that will be granted after punishment.

The hole he dug for others was the very same in which he fell

The Ṣaḥābah will not be disgraced on the Day of Qiyāmah, and the disbelievers and the sinful do not attain Allah's pleasure

This is why it is said that it has been first mentioned in Sūrah al-Taḥrīm:

يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِى اللّٰهُ النَّبِىَّ وَ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَه

[on] the Day when Allah will not disgrace the Prophet and those who believed with him.[1]

Thus, even the Shīʿah cannot criticise their īmān. Furthermore, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

Indeed, Allah does not love the disbelievers.

In another verse, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَرْضٰى عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ

Indeed, Allah is not satisfied with a defiantly disobedient people.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 8

2 Sūrah al-Taubah: 96

Therefore, if Allah is pleased with the Ṣaḥābah then there is doubt in their belief in the Prophet ﷺ. In addition, there is no possibility of them having been pious only for a short period during the life of the Prophet ﷺ. Thus, in accordance with the promise of Allah, they will be honoured and respected on the Day of Qiyāmah with the Prophet ﷺ. So how then can they be punished on the Day of Qiyāmah, when there is no greater disgrace then punishment on that Day? It is possible however, that those with obscure understanding may understand this (honour being granted to the Ṣaḥābah) to actually be punishment.

Secondly, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says in Sūrah al-Ambiyā':

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ سَبَقَتْ لَهُمْ مِّنَّا الْحُسْنٰى ۙ اُولٰٓئِكَ عَنْهَا مُبْعَدُوْنَ لَا يَسْمَعُوْنَ
حَسِيْسَهَا ۚ وَ هُمْ فِيْ مَا اشْتَهَتْ اَنْفُسُهُمْ خٰلِدُوْنَ لَا يَحْزُنُهُمُ الْفَزَعُ الْاَكْبَرُ
وَ تَتَلَقّٰهُمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ ؕ هٰذَا يَوْمُكُمُ الَّذِيْ كُنْتُمْ تُوْعَدُوْنَ

Indeed, those for whom the best [reward] has preceded from Us - they are from it far removed. They will not hear its sound, while they are, in that which their souls desire, abiding eternally. They will not be grieved by the greatest terror, and the angels will meet them, [saying], "This is your Day which you have been promised" [1]

Now ponder, Allah has promised a great success for them and assured them with such comforting words; to now regard such people deserving of punishment can only be the assumption of the foolish. The promise being made beforehand also clearly indicates the same, and in the hereafter, they will be re-assured of the promise that was made to them. To now claim that they will still be punished is an accusation that Allah will not fulfil His promise, Allah forbid. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is not the same as the Shīʿah, who practice *taqiyyah* (dissimulation) today and say whatever is required, then later go back on their word.

The disputes between the Ṣaḥābah does not necessitate disbelief or sin of either party since both negate Allah's pleasure

It is evident from the above that the battles or disputes that took place against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will neither necessitate kufr nor sin, as the Shīʿah assert. If so, then why did Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declare his pleasure for them, when he said:

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 101.

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

Indeed, Allah does not love the disbelievers.

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَرْضٰى عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ

Indeed, Allah is not satisfied with a defiantly disobedient people.

In fact, even denying the Imāmah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ does not necessitate disbelief or sin because according to the Shīʿah all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, with the exception of a few, denied his Imāmah. Further supporting this is the narration of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ reported in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, one of the most relied upon works of the Shīʿah. In this narration, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ said to Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ:

اصحبنا نقاتل اخواننا فی الاسلام علی ما دخل فیه من الزیغ و الاعوجاج

> We fight our Muslim brothers on account of the crookedness and deviation that has entered into dīn.

This proves that those who deny his Imāmah and fought against him are not kāfir and Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, despite his denial of the Imāmah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and opposition to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ which is well-known to all, was still a Muslim in the opinion of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. Thus, if one wishes to secure the beliefs of the Shīʿah faith, he will have to deny and refute all those narrations reporting disputes and disagreements between the Ṣaḥābah and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. If they refuse to do so then they will have to deny these verses of the Qur'ān. After all, ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ concealed the virtue and right of Imāmah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ by removing approximately eleven thousand verses of the Qur'ān (according to the Shīʿah paradigm), even though concealing the laws of dīn is a sin but deemed meritorious by the Shīʿah belief of taqiyyah. So, when fighting against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ does not necessitate kufr and even denial of his Imāmah does not render one a kāfir or a sinner, even though this is the third part of īmān of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Shīʿah, the other sins which are definitely lesser than this; how will it necessitate kufr? In light of this, even Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and his companions should be free from the slander of the Shīʿah.

Nonetheless, the verse: "*The fore-runners of the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār*" has rendered a strong and crushing reply to the Shīʿah argument, such that one cannot even claim that these three Ṣaḥābah (viz. Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ) and others

only embraced Islam after this verse was revealed because this verse is in Sūrah al-Tawbah, which was revealed two years before the demise of the Prophet ﷺ and these Ṣaḥābah all embraced Islam in Makkah. It is also not possible for anyone to attach the words *ihsān* (good deeds) as a clause to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār because ihsān is attached to the word "اتبعوهم" (those who follow them) which is a separate sentence.

The words of the verse: "*Superior in Rank*" establishes superiority of the Ṣaḥābah over the Imāms

In addition to the above, this verse and a few others related to it establishes the superiority of the three Ṣaḥābah (viz. Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم) and in fact all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. This reduces to dust another belief of the Shīʿah, namely that the A'immah of the Shīʿah are superior to the entire ummah and the Ambiyā' as well. This belief is refuted entirely by the Qur'ān because the verse in Sūrah al-Tawbah states that those of the Ṣaḥābah who brought īmān, performed hijrah, and waged Jihād in the path of Allah with their lives and wealth, they have surpassed every person in this ummah. This superiority is general and includes superiority over the Imāms as well. We learn from this that besides ʿAlī رضي الله عنه none of the Imāms could reach the level of these Ṣaḥābah, let alone the status of the Ambiyā'.

The verse which we refer to is:

اَلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَهَاجَرُوْا وَجٰهَدُوْا فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ بِاَمْوَالِهِمْ وَاَنْفُسِهِمْ ۙ اَعْظَمُ
دَرَجَةً عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفَآئِزُوْنَ يُبَشِّرُهُمْ رَبُّهُمْ بِرَحْمَةٍ مِّنْهُ وَرِضْوَانٍ
وَّجَنّٰتٍ لَّهُمْ فِيْهَا نَعِيْمٌ مُّقِيْمٌ ۙ خٰلِدِيْنَ فِيْهَآ اَبَدًا ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهٗٓ اَجْرٌ عَظِيْمٌ

The ones who have believed, emigrated and striven in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their lives are greater in rank in the sight of Allah. And it is those who are the attainers [of success]. Their Lord gives them good tidings of mercy from Him and approval and of gardens for them wherein is enduring pleasure. [They will be] abiding therein forever. Indeed, Allah has with Him a great reward.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 20-22

Chapter four

The belief of badā' and the confusion of the Shīʿah scholars

The Shīʿī scholars will now have no choice except to acknowledge the superiority of the Ṣaḥābah or they will have to resort to the principle:

الضرورة تبيح المحظورات

Necessity permits the prohibited.

and thereafter return to their age-old tenet and say:

> We accept that the Qur'ān proves what the Ahl al-Sunnah claims it does but what reliance can be placed on Allah? (Allah forbid!) Just as (according to our Shīʿī belief, whether you believe it or not) Allah experienced badā' in many aspects of dīn, He experienced badā' regarding the status of the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Sunnah, and even in protecting the Qur'ān. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى first had the intention that is mentioned in the Qur'ān but later changed his mind and this is the meaning of badā'.

Definitions of badā'

First definition

Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī, whom the present day Shīʿah might perhaps call a munāfiq, writes in his book *ʿIlm al-Hudā fi Taḥqīq al-Badā'*:

يقال بدا له إذا ظهر له رأي مخالف للرأي الأول

> One will say he experienced badā' when an opinion contrary to his former opinion becomes apparent to him.

Nizāmu al-dīn al-Jilānī writes in this same book that Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī and Shaykh Abū al-Fath al-Karājakī had the same opinion regarding the meaning of badā' because this is what al-Ṭūsī has written in his book, *ʿUddah*, and al-Karājakī in *Kanz al-Fawāʿid*.

Second definition

However, what Sharīf al-Murtaḍā has written in his book, *al-Dhariʿah*, (and the words of al-Ṭabarsī gives off the same stench) contradicts the meaning above because he writes:

معنى قولنا بدا له تعالى أنه ظهر له من الأمر ما لم يكن ظاهراً

> The meaning of our statement that Allah experienced badā' is that something became apparent to Allah which was not apparent before.

Thereafter Nizām al-dīn adds:

> The gist of this is that Allah learns of new things after they occur.

After this, he presents his own findings, which supports the second meaning, that at times Allah may experience badā' when giving information of future events. In simple words, sometimes Allah may say what is going to transpire and it does not come to pass.

Third definition

The later Shīʿah came to realise the mess this belief of badā' has caused and felt somewhat ashamed at the objections and criticisms raised by the Ahl al-Sunnah. Thus, they changed its meaning and said that badā' only applies to that knowledge which Allah does not inform anyone of, whereas in that knowledge sent to the Ambiyā' Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى does not lie. If the Shīʿah adhere firmly to this view, then they will receive a warm welcome and applause from the Ahl al-Sunnah. In that case, the words of Allah will be absolutely correct and on account of the Shīʿī belief of badā' there will no longer be any need to prove our claim from another source besides the Qur'ān.

However, Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī knew that to overcome the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah and establish their view, he would have to adhere to the confusing and embarrassing view of badā', and refute the few later Shīʿī scholars by claiming that this only applies to a specific type of knowledge. He reported numerous narrations from Shīʿī literature which utterly refutes the opinion of the later Shīʿī scholars. And why will he not, when he is a research scholar himself? This is why he wrote a special treatise on this subject. He mentions that whatever Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى stated was indeed the truth because it will only be considered a lie when it is intentional. So, when Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى was misinformed, Allah forbid, what fault of it is His that warrants the later Shīʿī scholars to say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى never lies to His close servants.

Three types of badā'

In short from all the narrations that Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī quoted to prove his claim, it is proven that there are three types of badā'.

1. ***Badā' fi l-ʿIlm:***- Allah had knowledge of something but only later the true reality became apparent.

2. ***Badā' fi l-Irādah:***- Allah initially intended to do something but then later realised that this was not the correct course of action.

3. ***Badā' fi l-Amr:***- Allah initially gave a command but then realised that this command was a mistake and then replaced it with a new one that does not have the same deficiency and is more suitable with the need of the hour.

The difference between badā' and naskh

One should not confuse badā' with *naskh* (abrogation) because naskh means that a specific ruling has come to an end and the time for another ruling has commenced. An example of this is the month of Ramaḍān, wherein fasting is compulsory but when the day of ʿĪd arrives then the ruling comes to an end and it is now time to stop fasting. It is not said that there was an error in the first ruling and therefore it was suspended, but rather the period of the ruling has come to an end and now the time for a new ruling has commenced. However, at times the time for the termination of the ruling may be given, such as in the example above, and at times it may not be given, but it will still terminate at its appointed time, for example the Sharīʿah of Nabī Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was to last until the arrival of The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and this was only known to Allah. If any person was aware of this, then he still did not know what the period would be and when would the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ arrive. In essence *badā' fi l-Amr*, which is also called *badā' fi al-Taklīf* by the Shīʿah, is something entirely different from naskh. In the case of badā' it would mean that first Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى ordered the fast of Ramaḍān and seeing that that there was no problem with it, maintained his instruction, but after sometime saw that it does not serve the need of the hour and therefore changed his order.

The three types of badā' each require the other

Once this is understood then listen further to this unworthy one; when *badā' fi al-Taklīf* occurs then *badā' fi l-Irādah*, also known as *badā' fi al-Takwīn*, will also

necessarily occur. The reason for this is that *badā' fi l-Irādah* is that change in decree which occurs on the discovery of a new requirement. So, if the ruling was changed on account of a new benefit then the intention for the initial ruling has also changed. Similarly, *badā' fi l-Irādah* will necessitate the occurrence of *badā' fi l-ʿIlm*, also known as *badā' fi l-Akhbār*. The reason for this is that if the intention changes when a new requirement is 'learnt', then it would mean that the knowledge acquired now was not known before and what was known before was ultimately incorrect, which in itself is known as *badā' fi l-ʿIlm*.

Therefore, if any Shīʿah believes in the occurrence of *badā' fi l-Amr* and *badā' fi l-Irādah*, but only to save face before the Ahl al-Sunnah distances himself from the belief of *badā' fi l-Akhbār*, then too this scheme will not work.

In short, the concept of badā' is an accepted concept amongst the Shīʿah and if anyone of them were to reply to this verse, in an effort to save themselves from the argument of the Ahl al-Sunnah, by saying:

> If you are able to prove your case from the Qur'ān, then we accept that this is what the Book of Allah says but what reliance can be placed upon the Qur'ān (Allah forbid)? Allah changes his opinion often and (Allah forbid) right, wrong, correct, incorrect, can all be found in His Book. Our Imāms on the other hand have knowledge of what happened and what is still to happen, so if the piety and integrity of the Ṣaḥābah were to be proven from their word instead then we would definitely accept it.

The consequences of the belief of badā'

The forgiveness of the four infallibles becomes doubtful

In this case, it would become incumbent upon us to dispose of the proof of the Shīʿah as well, as all fair-minded people would, because if this is the consequence of badā' then the first aspect that would come under question would be the forgiveness of the four 'infallibles', Allah forbid, so what guarantee do the Shīʿah now have? Just as the forgiveness promised to the Ṣaḥābah has been discarded under the concept of badā', if the same were to have occurred with the Imāms then please do tell us what authority the Imāms have over Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ? Especially since their taqiyyah and lack of courage (Allah forbid) has made a mockery of the entire dīn.

The extended absence of the final Imām is a sad plight indeed

In addition, the final Imām has opted to remain hidden, despite his absolute knowledge of his enemies and friends. He must definitely be aware that every year in Iran, thousands of Shīʿah faithful come out in the streets wailing and pleading for his arrival, prepared to sacrifice their lives and wealth. In India, Shīʿism is spreading daily, and every Shīʿah eagerly awaits the arrival of the Imām.

Yet even though his life is in his control and he knows that he will not die before his appointed time (which is also known to him), he chooses to remain hidden. It is uncertain what bravery and courage this is; such that even though his devotees increase by the day, he goes further and further into confinement, refusing to come forth. Even if there was something to fear, what of it; the Prophet ﷺ had a mere three hundred and thirteen men around him and he waged jihād and then too, according to the Shīʿah, majority of them were munāfiqīn, and those who were not munāfiqīn, were not as sincere and devoted as the Imāmiyyah are to their final Imām. Our astonishment will continue but still the occultation of the final Imām will not end, despite the peace, support, and power he has at his hands. This can only mean that the Imāms having knowledge of the past, present and future is false, or the love which the Shīʿah profess is false. We know for a fact that under the pretence of love, the Shīʿah have ascribed numerous weaknesses to their Imāms, a few of which will become apparent to the readers in this treatise.

Perhaps Allah experienced badā' when appointing the Imāms

In essence, the final Imām refuses to come forth from his cave in Surra min Raʾā, despite the insistence and pleas of his supporters and he refuses to do anything about the deviation and plight of the ummah. What greater deviation can there be than the dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ being replaced by the "dīn of Abū Bakr", the Book of Allah being replaced by the "Pages of ʿUthmān", and the twelve Imāms being replaced by the likes of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Shafiʿī, etc. (as the Shīʿah assert); that one should continue waiting. The other Imāms were excused on account of them not having any supporters or assistance but what excuse does the twelfth Imām have? The only possible answer to all of this, if we were to accept the Shīʿī concept of badā'; is that Allah made a mistake (Allah forbid) in appointing the Imāms whereas he should have appointed Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم as the Imāms, who would have lit the lamps of guidance and provided peace to all this

chaos. Thus, the Imāmiyyah have no other explanation for this delay but the above (that badā' has taken place). If on the other hand, they were to say that it is not incumbent upon Allah to do as is required by man then they could say:

لَا يَسْئَلُ عَمَّا يَفْعَلُ وَهُمْ يُسْئَلُوْنَ

He is not questioned about what He does, but they will be questioned.[1]

The twelfth Imām has been deposed by Allah because of badā'

Thus, it would not be strange that amongst the badā' that occurred, badā' also was experienced regarding the twelfth Imām and he has been deposed. This would explain why the absence of the Imām has passed the calculated date of his arrival. This would mean that the belief (of the Shīʿah) that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا, etc. will be resurrected in the last days of this world is not incorrect and since the twelfth Imām has been deposed, they will be resurrected to take his place. Thus, the Shīʿah were mistaken in believing that they will be resurrected to be punished. Nevertheless, this discussion must have been displeasing to the Shīʿah.

Refutation of badā' from the Qur'ān

Therefore, for the sake of the Shīʿah, I will refrain from this and reply that even if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى could err (as the Shīʿah suggest), he did not err with the Ambiyā'. We know that the Shīʿah also do not believe that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى errs when relaying information of past events as this would be no less than a blatant lie. Once this is understood, I wish to add that in Sūrah Ṭāhā, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى relates the incidents of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, which occurred long before the era of The Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and mentions the reply Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ gave to Firʿawn:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّيْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.[2]

Ponder over this verse, what is Allah saying? We all know Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, even the Shīʿah will not say that he used to err. The Shīʿah have reserved this fault solely

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā: 23.

2 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52.

for Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى as then it would necessitate that an infallible may err. In this case, the very criticism they make against the Ahl al-Sunnah, that the Khulafā' and Imāms (of the Ahl al-Sunnah) were not *maʿsūm* (infallible) whereas an imām or khalīfah must be infallible so that it can be possible to differentiate between truth and falsehood, will in actual fact apply to them as well.

The Shīʿah principle dictates that Allah may err but not the infallible Imāms

The principles of the Shīʿah inform us that it is possible for Allah to err but an infallible cannot. Thus, the statement of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِالسَّلَام, who was infallible according to consensus of both factions:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّيْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.

has no possibility of error. Furthermore, this incident is of the past and not anything still to transpire, which could fall in the category of *badā' fi l-Akhbār*. What then is the meaning of "*My Rabb does not err nor does He forget*"? (Allah forbid) Did some shortcoming befall the memory and senses of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى in the era of the Prophet صَلَّىاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّم? Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُمَا were most definitely awe-inspiring personalities, but to the extent that they could strike awe into Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى? We seek Allah's refuge from such blasphemy, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is far greater and above such faults. In their attempts to mislead the Ahl al-Sunnah they have also cast the honour of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى behind their backs. (The Shīʿah continue to assert that) When Fadak was taken, it was Abū Bakr رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ who took it, when the pen and paper was not brought, it was ʿUmar رَضِيَاللّٰهُعَنْهُ who did not bring it; and they absolved themselves from them, so now did Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى, who was aware of all of this, fail to assist those who were oppressed, even though assisting the oppressed is the path of truth? May Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى blacken the faces of these uncouth people. In essence, the Qur'ān uproots any possibility of badā' ever occurring.

The supplication of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq against those who believe in badā'

If the Shīʿah do not have the slightest reliance in Allah and insist, considering it possible that Allah may have erred in relaying the incidents of the past, that we

will not refute the belief of badā' on the testimony of the Qur'ān until and unless al-Kulaynī reports a narration in this regard. Therefore, we report the narrations of al-Kulaynī:

> عی منصور بن حازم عن ابی عبد الله قال منصور سالته هل یکون شیء لم یکن فی علم الله قال لا من قال هذا فاخزاه الله قلت ارئیت ما کان و ما هو کائن الی یوم القیامة لیس فی علم الله قال بلی قبل ان یخلق الخلق
>
> Mansūr ibn Hāzim narrates: "I asked Jaʿfar al-Sādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ whether there is anything that is not in the knowledge of Allah?" He replied: "No! May Allah disgrace whoever says (and believes) that." I then asked him: "Do you believe that everything that has happened and what is still to happen until the Day of Qiyāmah is not in the knowledge of Allah?" He replied: "No! (He knew everything) Even before he created it."

Two points are learnt from this narration:

1. Badā' is an incorrect belief, because it has become clear from the problems that arise from this belief explained previously that it is impossible for Allah to acquire new knowledge (which was previously unknown to Him).
2. Jaʿfar Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ supplicated against those who adhere to the belief of badā'.

Thus, we too congratulate the Shīʿah. All these problems arose on account of them not understanding the Book of Allah and what fault of theirs is it? They do not even understand their own reports. If they had any understanding at all then they would have understood their books first, after all the Qur'ān is the Book of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

After understanding the truth, it is compulsory to accept

It is now incumbent to explain the motive of this erroneous belief so that further contentment may be gained and the readers will not be left in doubt and say: "Why should we abandon the belief of badā' simply on what is written in this treatise, after all our Shīʿī ʿUlamā' must have believed in this for a reason. So, until we discuss this with them, we will not be content." This excuse is an epitome of the saying:

The excuse for the sin is worse than the sin itself.

When the truth has become clear then what need is there for him to wait on another. If one person watches the sun set with his naked eye and another sits in his home, staring at his watch waiting for the time of sunset; the one looking at the sun may be the most ignorant and the one sitting at home the greatest scholar, but the one gazing at the sun will not wait for confirmation from the one sitting at home.

Similarly, when it has become clear, in light of the Qur'ān and Shīʿī narration as well, that the belief of badā' is incorrect then why delay in accepting the truth. In this instance the most appropriate course of action would be that just as the one who gazes at the sun accepts that it has set without second thought, despite his ignorance, so too should those who have understood the error of badā' absolve themselves from it without second thought and say that those who believed in it, even though the most learned, were after all men and erred as all men do. They did not understand the verse of the Qur'ān:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ عَلِيْمًا حَكِيْمًا

Indeed, Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise.[1]

nor did they understand the verse:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.

And they paid no attention to the narration of al-Kulaynī. In fact, the most respectful thing to do would be to say that these people (who believed in badā') did not memorise the Qur'ān, since it is the duty of the Ahl al-Sunnah to do so.

In essence, the excuse that the proofs of the Shīʿah need to be known first (before accepting the truth), after having understood the words of the Qur'ān, which have no alternate interpretation and the ḥadīth mentioned above, is not worthy of ear to those of intellect.

The foundation of the whimsical belief of badā'

However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī audaciously claimed that the cause of this erroneous belief amongst the Shīʿah is verses like:

1 Sūrah al-Insān: 30.

الَّذِیْ خَلَقَ الْمَوْتَ وَ الْحَیٰوۃَ لِیَبْلُوَکُمْ اَیُّکُمْ اَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا

[He] who created death and life to test you [as to] which of you is best in deed.[1]

On account of this verse and others similar to it, the Shīʿī ʿUlamā' believed that a test takes place where the end result is not known. He then went further and said that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ says in another verse:

یَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا یَشَآءُ وَیُثْبِتُ

Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book.[2]

When they studied this verse with the verse mentioned previously, the Shīʿī ʿUlamā' were convinced that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ was unaware of the true reality of matters and instead wherever He has expressed an opinion at first and later discovered it to be different, He changed His opinion and this is the meaning of badā'. In short, this is the manner in which the belief of badā' found its way into Shīʿī theology. The error which was first committed on account of lack of understanding was just reinforced further.

The harm of no teacher

Why should they not misunderstand such verses? Those without a teacher (and attempt to traverse the path of learning on their own) always falter. If they were to have approached the experts in the field of studying the Qur'ān, then they would not have committed such an error. However, this sect is so unfortunate that they are the severe enemies of those who understand the Qur'ān. The Ṣaḥābah, who were the students of the Prophet صَلَّىٰاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ, were the ones who understood the Qur'ān; so those who benefited from the Ṣaḥābah, will they understand the Qur'ān or the Shīʿah?

The objective of testing man is not to gain new knowledge

If one were to conclude from the verse above that Allah does not have knowledge of anything before creating it, which the Shīʿah believe, then Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has said in numerous places in the Qur'ān:

---

1 Sūrah al-Mulk: 2.

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ بَصِيْرٌ

Indeed, Allah sees whatever you are doing.[1]

Thus, even if we were to accept that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ did not have knowledge of one's actions before creating him, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ makes it clear that he has complete knowledge of all that one does, so what further thought is required on this? Allah is not dependent upon the light of the sun, He does not require light to see, the front and back are both equal to Him because He states:

اَلَآ اِنَّه بِكُلِّ شَىْءٍ مُّحِيْطٌ

Unquestionably He is, of all things, encompassing.[2]

In essence, once things have come into existence then there is no doubt that Allah sees them and then there is no possibility of Allah ever forgetting as Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has said in Sūrah Ṭāhā,

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err nor does he forget.

So now what need is there to appoint the *al-Kirām al-Kātibīn* (angels who record the deeds of man), and that the reckoning on the Day of Qiyāmah only take place after man reads their Book of Deeds? Whatever reply the Shīʿah will give to this, will be our reply as well.

If their answer is that Allah knows every single thing; big or small, apparent or hidden, but Allah's immense wisdom and grandeur dictates that system operate then we will accept it and this is our response as well. If the Shīʿah reply that taking reckoning from the Book of Deeds and the testimony of man's hands and feet is to grant realisation to man, then we also say that this test from Allah is to grant realisation to man.

If anyone doubts that the hands and feet of man will testify against him or that reckoning will be taken and the Deeds will be weighed, then the following verses of the Noble Qur'ān are present:

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 110.

2 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 54.

يَّوْمَ تَشْهَدُ عَلَيْهِمْ اَلْسِنَتُهُمْ وَ اَيْدِيْهِمْ وَ اَرْجُلُهُمْ بِمَا كَانُوْا يَعْمَلُوْنَ

On a Day when their tongues, their hands and their feet will bear witness against them as to what they used to do.[1]

The gist of which is that they will only be punished after their hands and feet testify against them. The following verse states the same:

وَقَالُوْا لِجُلُوْدِهِمْ لِمَ شَهِدْتُّمْ عَلَيْنَاؕ قَالُوْٓا اَنْطَقَنَا اللّٰهُ الَّذِىْٓ اَنْطَقَ كُلَّ شَىْءٍ

And they will say to their skins, "Why have you testified against us?" They will say, "We were made to speak by Allah, who has made everything speak"[2]

In addition, there are numerous other verses which prove that the deeds of man will be weighed on the Day of Qiyāmah:

وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذِ الْحَقُّ

And the weighing [of deeds] that Day will be the truth.[3]

وَ نَضَعُ الْمَوَازِيْنَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ

And We place the scales of justice for the Day of Resurrection.[4]

فَاَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِيْنُه ۙ فَهُوَ فِىْ عِيْشَةٍ رَّاضِيَةٍ

Then as for one whose scales are heavy [with good deeds], He will be in a pleasant life.[5]

وَ اِنْ تُبْدُوْا مَا فِىْٓ اَنْفُسِكُمْ اَوْ تُخْفُوْهُ يُحَاسِبْكُمْ بِهِ اللّٰهُ

Whether you show what is within yourselves or conceal it, Allah will bring you to account for it.[6]

---

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 24.

2 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 21.

3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 8.

4 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 47.

5 Sūrah al-Qāriʿah: 6,7.

6 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 284.

وَمَنْ يَّكْفُرْ بِاٰيٰتِ اللّٰهِ فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ سَرِيْعُ الْحِسَابِ

And whoever disbelieves in the verses of Allah, then indeed, Allah is swift in [taking] account.[1]

In short, these aspects cannot be denied. The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah and the Ahl al-Sunnah are both in agreement on this.

Whatever the Shīʿah will reply, we will not shy away from it. If they say that this will be done to merely complete the proof on man and if this were not the case, then there would be no need for it then we too agree with it.

An example from the Qur'ān of completing proof against man

If one wishes to understand this by way of an example then understand this example, which even ʿAmmār ʿAlī accepts; the Shīʿah must remember Sūrah al-Baqarah? If they do not, then they must remember a portion of it at least. In the first chapter, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ mentions the incident when He intended to appoint Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ as his deputy on earth and the angels asked how could man be appointed as deputies when they will spread corruption and murder on earth, whilst they (the angels) are more deserving of such a position. They were the ones who glorified Allah, praised Allah but Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ replied to them:

Indeed, I know that which you do not know.

However, to complete His proof on the angels, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ taught Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ the names of a few items and then asked the angels to inform Him thereof: "If you are truthful in your claim then answer my question." Since the angels had no knowledge of this, they replied:

سُبْحٰنَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَآ اِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا ؕ اِنَّكَ اَنْتَ الْعَلِيْمُ الْحَكِيْمُ

Exalted are You; we have no knowledge except what You have taught us. Indeed, it is You who is the Knowing, the Wise.[2]

When they could not answer, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ ordered Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ to mention the name of those things and when he did, Allah said to the angels:

---

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 19.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 32.

قَالَ اَلَمْ اَقُلْ لَّكُمْ اِنِّيْٓ اَعْلَمُ غَيْبَ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ ۙ وَاَعْلَمُ مَا تُبْدُوْنَ وَمَا كُنْتُمْ تَكْتُمُوْنَ

"Did I not tell you that I know the unseen [aspects] of the heavens and the earth? And I know what you reveal and what you have concealed."?[1]

We ask the Shīʿah scholars, in the name of Allah, please ponder over this incident. Did Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ test the angels so that He could learn the reality or to provide clear proof to the angels? When Allah had already informed Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ of the answer and not informed the angels then even the most dim-witted person will not doubt Allah having knowledge of who is more deserving of being His deputy. Thus, just as this test was only to complete the proof against the angels and do away with their objections, so too is the test which Allah takes from man so that they will have no proof or argument against Allah.

Nubuwwah and establishing the laws of Sharīʿah is also to present a clear proof to man

This is also the reason for establishing the laws of Sharīʿah and the wisdom behind sending the Ambiyā' because when the angels do not disobey Allah and are always obedient, as indicated by the verse:

لَّا يَعْصُوْنَ اللّٰهَ مَآ اَمَرَهُمْ وَ يَفْعَلُوْنَ مَا يُؤْمَرُوْنَ

They do not disobey Allah in what He commands them but do what they are commanded.[2]

It is only man who objects to the decrees of Allah as man is after all human and amidst mention of the faults of man, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ said:

وَكَانَ الْاِنْسَانُ اَكْثَرَ شَيْءٍ جَدَلًا

But man has ever been, most of anything, [prone to] dispute.[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 33.

2 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 6.

3 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 54.

Thus, if Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى were to enter the Ambiyā' and the true believers into Jannah based upon His infinite knowledge, and Firʿawn, Abū Jahl and the disbelievers into Jahannam; would Firʿawn and Abū Jahl remain silent? No! They would raise objection after objection, continuously claiming that it is their right to enter Jannah. This is why the All-Mighty Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has mentioned repeatedly in the Qur'ān the reason for this chain of guidance. We will mention one of these verses for the contentment of the readers:

وَ اتَّبِعُوْٓا اَحْسَنَ مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكُمْ مِّنْ رَّبِّكُمْ مِّنْ قَبْلِ اَنْ يَّاْتِيَكُمُ الْعَذَابُ بَغْتَةً وَّ اَنْتُمْ لَا تَشْعُرُوْنَ اَنْ تَقُوْلَ نَفْسٌ يّٰحَسْرَتٰى عَلٰى مَا فَرَّطْتُّ فِيْ جَنْۢبِ اللّٰهِ وَ اِنْ كُنْتُ لَمِنَ السّٰخِرِيْنَ اَوْ تَقُوْلَ لَوْ اَنَّ اللّٰهَ هَدٰىنِيْ لَكُنْتُ مِنَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ اَوْ تَقُوْلَ حِيْنَ تَرَى الْعَذَابَ لَوْ اَنَّ لِيْ كَرَّةً فَاَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُحْسِنِيْنَ بَلٰى قَدْ جَآءَتْكَ اٰيٰتِيْ فَكَذَّبْتَ بِهَا وَ اسْتَكْبَرْتَ وَكُنْتَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

And follow the best of what was revealed to you from your Lord [i.e., the Qur'ān] before the punishment comes upon you suddenly while you do not perceive, lest a soul should say, "Oh, [how great is] my regret over what I neglected in regard to Allah and that I was among the mockers." Or [lest] it say, "If only Allah had guided me, I would have been among the righteous." Or [lest] it say when it sees the punishment, "If only I had another turn so I could be among the doers of good." But yes, there had come to you My verses, but you denied them and were arrogant, and you were among the disbelievers.[1]

This was the translation of the verse. What was the reason for Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى saying: "Follow the best, which your Rabb has revealed to you"? The only possible reason was that there was the possibility of a person saying that if Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى had guided him then he would most definitely have been from amongst the pious. Such a complaint would only be possible if Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى had decided (without testing) who is destined for Jannah and who is destined for Jahannam. In this instance, the one who is cast into Jahannam will claim that he has not gotten what he deserved and complain as to why he was not tested first, as perhaps he would have been amongst the pious and Allah-fearing. Yet Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has said:

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 55.

وَكُنْتَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

You were among the disbelievers.

And Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى did not say:

كَفَرْتَ

You disbelieved.

Those who understand the Arabic language and its usage, know full-well that if Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى had said: "You disbelieved" then it would mean that you disbelieved when our verses came to you and that is when you became a kāfir and not before the verses were revealed. On the contrary, when Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى said: "You were among the disbelievers", then it means from before time already you were a kāfir and accordingly you still disbelieved when our signs came to you.

Similarly, in Sūrah al-Aʿrāf:

اَنْ تَقُوْلُوْا يَوْمَ الْقِيٰمَةِ اِنَّا كُنَّا عَنْ هٰذَا غٰفِلِيْنَ

Lest you should say on the Day of Resurrection, "Indeed, we were of this unaware."[1]

In other words, the pledge which was taken when Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى asked:

اَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ

Am I not your Lord?

was so that at the time of punishment you should not give the excuse that you did not know. In reality, since man is as described previously (it is in his nature to argue), Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى instituted this test of *aʿamāl* (deeds) so that they will have no argument to present nor will they be able to accuse Allah of injustice. This is why Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى said:

لِيَبْلُوَكُمْ اَيُّكُمْ اَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا

To test you [as to] which of you is best in deed

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 172.

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ

And We will surely test you until We make evident those who strive among you [for the cause of Allah] and the patient, and We will test your affairs.[1]

The summary of all of this is that if you have any misconceptions against us and think that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ does not know who is good or who is bad, which is the reason why he tests man, then it would mean that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ thought someone to be bad and as a result sent him to Jahannam, which is unjust. On the other hand, Allah knew already who is good and who is not, and tested us to make known to us who is good and who is bad, who is steadfast and who strives in the path of Allah. In summary, the purpose of this test is to present a clear proof to man and not so that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ can gain knowledge.

The meaning of "*Test your affairs*"

In the second verse, "*Test your affairs*" is mentioned, which also calls out loudly that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ was not unaware of the conditions of man and knew the conditions of the pious and evil from before time because in this case the meaning of this verse will be: the reality of your actions which is known to us and which you doubt, we will examine that as well. This makes it clear that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ already had knowledge of everything beforehand and it is not as the Imāmiyyah claim that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ only learns of the nature of a thing after creating it, the reference of Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī has already been mentioned above, but rather this entire system has been put into place to present a clear proof to man, just as with the angels. The reality is that just as Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ knew from before that Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ is more worthy of khilāfah and the angels do not possess the same qualities, so too was Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ aware from before time of who is deserving of Jannah and who is deserving of Jahannam. Just as we know that wood is meant for burning and bread is meant for eating, if Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ knew who is meant for Jahannam and who is meant for Jannah, there is no injustice at all. However, man is not the same as the angels, their nature is more defiant; this is why this entire system and examination has been put into place.

By the grace of Allah, the misconception which the Shīʿah scholars have fallen into, on account of the verse cited above, has been lifted and the correct meaning of the

1 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31.

verse has become known. One should not be hasty and rush to the first interpretation that comes to mind when reciting a verse but it needs to be understood in light of other verses of the Qur'ān. If this is the Shīʿī way of interpretation, then it is quite possible that tomorrow they will say regarding the following verses:

ونَادى أَصْحَابَ الْجَنَّةِ

The residents of Jannah called out.

وَنَادى أَصْحَابَ الْأَعْرَافِ

Those residing on Aʿrāf called out.

وَنَادى أَصْحَابَ النَّارِ

The dwellers of the fire called out.

And other verses of this nature, that they refer to incidents which have already transpired because putting aside the verses and aḥādīth which indicate that Qiyāmah is still going to take place, this verse informs us that it has already taken place because the past tense verb has been used in it. Little do they know that when something is still going to happen but its occurrence is certain then in common language it is said that it had happened. When judgement is passed for execution then people say he is dead (even though he is still going to be executed).

Even if the meaning of these verses might not appear to be the same as the other verses, even the most novice Arabic student will conclude that the people of Jannah could not have called upon the people of Jahannam as no one has entered Jannah or Jahannam as yet. Instead, these events are still going to transpire on the Day of Qiyāmah. The preceding and following verses also attest to the same and the Imāmiyyah also say the same. Therefore, just as these words, due to other evidence, has an alternate meaning other than the apparent (i.e. it has not occurred and is still going to transpire) so too there is no harm in taking the verse: "We shall certainly test you", which indicates the future tense, on account of those verses which prove the infinite knowledge of Allah of everything before its creation, to refer to the past.

If you seek to verify the alternate meaning, then listen well. Just as when something that is still going to transpire is certain and its occurrence incumbent, it may be referred to in the past tense, so too can something which has occurred, but its reality, occurrence and existence to an extent hidden, be referred to in the future tense on account of the reality of its occurrence and non-occurrence only becoming known later. If an example is required then listen closely, when a person is severely ill and then is suddenly cured, it is obvious that his strength will not return as soon as he is cured but he will gain his strength slowly. If some of his creditors were to now come and ask their right from him, then the patient, if he has no wealth, will say that he will pay the debt as soon as he is better, even though he has been informed that he is cured of his illness.

Or assume that the sick person was not made aware that he has been cured; many a time a doctor can tell by the signs that he has been cured, yet he will tell the patient that he may pay him after he is cured. Thus, because the signs of the patient being cured have still not become apparent, i.e. he has not gained his strength, both the patient and the doctor use the future tense when referring to the cure of the illness; as if he has not been cured.

In the same way, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى in His eternal knowledge knew full-well that the Ṣaḥābah were mujāhidīn and would be patient in adversity and the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah would be evil doers. The Ṣaḥābah on account of the fortune destined for them from before and their noble demeanour were worthy of being entrusted with a noble work and bestowed with qualities of perfection. The enemies of the Ṣaḥābah on the other hand because of the misfortune destined for them from before and their depraved character, were capable of only carrying out shameful deeds, on account of which their hearts will be blackened. However, this could not become evident, despite Allah's knowledge of it, until the laws of Sharī'ah were established and the deeds they were meant to perform were not carried out by their own hands yet you will find many unfortunate individuals still doubting this knowledge of Allah, just as the ill doubt the word of the doctor (that he has been cured) because of his usage of the future tense.

A common example of eternal fortune and eternal misfortune

As for the fortune and misfortune of man being decreed from eternity and being an inherent quality and not something that is attained or temporary, this is an intricate

matter but to those of understanding this difference is the same as the difference between the intelligent and the foolish, the compassionate and the harsh, the generous and the miserly, the brave and the cowardly, the knowledgeable and the ignorant. Just as a wise king will take scholarly duties from the knowledgeable and not from the ignorant, so too does Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ take from man according to his capability.

All times (i.e. past, present and future) exist collectively

The reality is that time, from eternity until the infinite, exists as one; the past has not gone and the future is not absent. The reason for this is that if a person says: "Zaid is standing" then by listening to this statement everyone understands that Zaid exists and that this is his condition (i.e. he is standing). It is obvious that anything can only be in a particular state if it first exists. Once this has been understood then I wish to add that all those occurrences meant to happen on the Day of Qiyāmah, regarding which Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ says, and all know that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ is Truthful:

اِنَّ السَّاعَةَ اٰتِيَةٌ

Indeed, the Hour is coming.[1]

Or as is said in another verse:

اِنَّ زَلْزَلَةَ السَّاعَةِ شَيْءٌ عَظِيْمٌ

Indeed, the convulsion of the [final] Hour is a terrible thing.[2]

In accordance with the rule mentioned above, we also understand that Qiyāmah exists and its condition is such that it is coming towards us and it is a grave matter. We believe in it without need for repetition nor do we make excuses or arguments (against it). If some mullah were to argue that there are many things whose qualities are mentioned but do not exist, for example: if a person were to say that a certain person has died or a certain thing does not exist (then even though the quality has been mentioned, they still do not exist), then, firstly, such an objection does not warrant a reply. However, if we were to reply then it should be understood that this

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 15.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 1.

statement is not describing a quality but rather stating the lack of any quality. On the contrary, when a person states that a certain person is standing or a certain thing is coming; it leaves no doubt as to its existence and establishes that it is going to occur. Therefore, when these qualities prove the existence of a thing, why are we second guessing the existence of Qiyāmah? Once this has been established, I wish to add further that just as Qiyāmah has been proven to be coming and on account of this quality, its existence also established; matters of the past are still passing. In addition, when Qiyāmah, etc. has been described to be already in motion then it means then one day it will reach us and then pass. Thus, saying that a certain person has left, which establishes his existence, is no different from saying that a certain person is coming. In this manner both angles, the future and the past, are the same and exist together.

All tenses are the same to Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ

As a result of the statement of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ:

اَلَآ اِنَّه بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ مُّحِیْطٌ

Unquestionably He is, of all things, encompassing.[1]

every tense (past, present and future) is encompassed by Allah. Thus, whichever meaning one might take for Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ encompassing everything, at the least this much is incumbent; that the knowledge of Allah encompasses everything. The following verse testifies to this precise meaning:

اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عِلْمًا

Allah has encompassed all things in knowledge.[2]

In this case, all the things that exist in the past and in future are the same to Allah, despite the difference that might exist between them. The future exists but when the future passes then it becomes of the past.

Understand Allah's knowledge of the future and past from the following example:

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 54.

2 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12

A person stands in the middle of a river, whatever is in the water on all four sides is in his view and seen as one, even though some of it is still coming towards him and some has already flowed past.

The past and future is all the present to Allah

In essence, all aspects of time and whatever happens, all of it is within the sight of Allah and seen by Him as one and when this is the case then all time becomes the present. However, in relation to each other they precede and follow, and the difference between past, present and future is between each other. Just as a person who stands in one place, in relation to him what lies before him will be called the front and what lies behind him will be called the back, whatever occurs in a specific time, it will be called the past when compared to the following hour, the future when compared to the hour before it and the present when the precise hour it occurred in is considered. Thus, all of these times are the same before Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى in existence, but in relation to each other they are divided into past, present and future.

The usage of past, present and future tenses in the Qur'ān

At times Allah speaks in accordance to how matters appear to Him (without any difference in time) and at times He speaks taking into account the relation it has with time. In the first instance (when Allah speaks in accordance to how matters appear to him), He will always use the past or the present tense, whereas in the second case if the matter happened in the past, He uses the past tense, if it is the present, He uses the present tense and if it still to happen then the future tense is used.

The reason Allah also uses the past tense and not only the present tense, even though all tenses are the same to Him, is because Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى wishes to either inform one of the occurrence of a matter or the continuation of it. Thus, the matter which Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى informs one of; if it is to inform of its continuation, then on account of it continuing and the manner in which Allah sees things, it will always be the present. Whereas if it is to inform one of the occurrence of a matter then the time when it is given will not remain the present but become the past (so the past tense is used), since occurrences are momentary not perpetual. Accordingly, if one is being informed of something that is still going to happen, it should be in the future tense. Thus, information of an occurrence cannot be in the present tense,

it will either be in the past tense or the future tense. If anyone is informed of the occurrence of a matter before it occurs then he will inform others of it in the future tense and after it occurs and he witnesses it, he will inform others in the past tense. He will only be able to use the present tense if the occurrence continues. However, everything in the knowledge of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ is the present, so wherever he informs others of something that is still going to occur in the past tense, such as:

The residents of Jannah called out.

He does so because everything is the present to Him (and Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has already seen what is going to happen) and wherever He makes mention of matters which already occurred in the future tense, such as:

Until We ascertain those of you who strive.

He does so because that event in relation to what is before it, is the future (and is not in accordance with how it appears to Him).

The universe is not eternal because it does not continue

May the level-headed gauge this discussion fairly and then admit that this unworthy one, even though insignificant, speaks the truth. Let it not be that on account of your misunderstanding, you accuse the author of believing the universe to be eternal. It is for this reason that I wish to state beforehand that for anything to be eternal, it is necessary that it must exist continuously, i.e. it must exist long before time and long after time. It must not be proven to exist in a fixed period as then it will be temporary and not eternal.

Two ways of attaining knowledge: Through means and without means

If someone finds this discussion to be too confusing and finds it difficult to understand its meaning then there is a second method by which we are able to conclude that Allah's knowledge is eternal and encompasses everything, which will also explain the meaning of the verses quoted in the preceding pages.

When we explore the knowledge we have, we learn that knowledge of things is acquired in two ways:

Without means

With means, which can be either *lāzim* (incumbent) or *malzūm* (necessitated).

A person can learn whether the sun has risen or if there is sunshine without means, by seeing it with his own eyes, or learn of it with means, that is when seeing the sunshine, he learns that the sun has risen or when he sees the sun, he knows there is sunshine. For example, if a person is sitting in his home where he cannot see the sun but sees the sunshine then by means of the sunshine, he learns that the sun has risen. This knowledge of the sun rising he has gained with means which is *lāzim* (incumbent). However, if he sees the sun directly while sitting in the courtyard of his home and determines that there is sunshine then this knowledge (of the sunshine) he has gained with means that is *malzūm* (necessitated). In a similar manner, consider fire and smoke. At times knowledge of this is learnt without means, when looking at the fire or smoke with the naked eye, and at times with means, when he sees smoke from behind the wall and knows that there is a fire or sees the fire of a lamp from afar and knows that there must be smoke.

Generally, knowledge is learnt with means and without means

Generally, when something is learnt without means it necessitates learning it with means as well, which occurs simultaneously with no precedence given to either. For example, a person sees a fire up close and obviously sees its smoke as well, so in this case knowledge of the fire has been learnt from two ways; without means — because he saw it with his naked eye, and with means — because seeing the smoke informs him there is a fire. Therefore, even though a person sees the fire, he still determines from the smoke that it is a fire. What shortcoming has befallen the smoke on account of him seeing the fire that it will no longer indicate that a fire is burning?

Sometimes knowledge acquired with means is concealed because of the knowledge acquired without means

If one were to ponder deeply then he would conclude that the knowledge acquired with means is sometimes concealed by the knowledge acquired without means to such an extent that he does not even perceive it. When he saw the fire and saw the smoke, the knowledge of the fire which he learnt by seeing it directly conceals the knowledge of the fire he gained by seeing the smoke. This is an example of how in the day the stars still shine but they are eclipsed by the radiant rays of the sun, such that their presence is not even perceived.

Sometimes knowledge of two things is acquired without means or one with means and the other without means

Once this has been thoroughly understood that one thing may be learnt without means and with means at the same time, then also keep in mind that two things can also be learnt without means. For example, one sees the fire and the smoke at the same time. In a similar manner, when it is clear that a thing might be known directly or by means of something and sometimes it is known by both means, we also need to know that two things can become known simultaneously without means, for example; one sees fire and smoke at the same time. In a similar fashion, one can be learnt without means and the other with means, both at the same time, for example learning of the fire without means (by seeing it) and of the smoke with means (of the fire) or learning of the smoke without means (by seeing it) and of the fire with means (of the smoke). Knowledge of the fire is gained instantaneously such that it is never said that I learnt of this at this time and of the other at another time.

There is no precedence in the Knowledge which Allah gains without means and with means

Rationally one might understand there to be a sequence of one occurring before the other, knowledge acquired without means occurring before that with means. In other words, a person will regard the knowledge of the latter to be dependent upon the knowledge of the first. Such as when a person shakes something in his hand, even though they move simultaneously, he will say that the hand moves first then what is in his hand. Therefore, in this instance, even though the knowledge of both occurs simultaneously, the knowledge attained without means is said to precede that which occurs with means and just as a person can say that he shook his hand in order to shake what was in his hand, so too it can be said that he looked at the sunshine to gain knowledge of the sun.

The knowledge of Allah gained without means is mentioned in the past and present tense in the Qur'ān and that gained with means is mentioned in the future tense

After having understood this introductory lesson, I wish to state that mentioning:

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ

And We will surely test you until We make evident those who strive among you [for the cause of Allah] and the patient, and We will test your affairs.[1]

in the future tense will not affect the claim that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى's knowledge is eternal in the least because Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has knowledge of everything from two means, without means and with means simultaneously. The reason being that everything has a sign and just as the *lāzim* (incumbent) and *malzūm* (necessitated) can be learnt without means, so too can they be learnt by means of each other. In addition, both of these have existed with each other since eternity, even though that learnt with means becomes concealed by that learnt without means. In this manner as well, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has knowledge of everything with means at the same time that he has knowledge of it without means from eternity, but since that which is learnt without means is given precedence over that which is learnt with means (knowledge acquired without means regarded to have come first and knowledge with means second), wherever the knowledge of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is mentioned in the future tense, it refers to the knowledge He has with means, as there is no difference in time to Him, and wherever He has used the past or present tense it refers to the knowledge He has without means.

Since the knowledge of man is all with means, they were addressed in the future tense

Since Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى was addressing man in the Qur'ān, and man — in fact all creatures of intellect — attain their knowledge with means and not without, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى addressed them in the future tense. The salient qualities of the soul or of man such as generosity, bravery, compassion, etc. if they exist, they exist within in the heart and are not perceived by the eye or any of the five senses. If the existence of these qualities is learnt, then it is learnt by its effects. Generosity is learnt by giving, which is the action of the hand, bravery is learnt by his courage in battle, which is the action of the hands and legs, compassion is learnt from the kind words one speaks, which is the action of the tongue, and in a similar manner the presence of the soul is determined by movement, which are all actions of the body.

1 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31.

If Allah were to have spoken through His knowledge without means, then it would not serve as proof against them

Wherever Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has used the future tense then it is in matters which cannot be learnt by man without means (thus the future tense was used to indicate that they will learn of this in the future). If Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ were to have spoken to man in relation to His knowledge without means, then it would not serve as proof against man. This is why wherever Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ referred to a matter that would serve as a proof against man, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ used the future tense in relation to the knowledge they would learn with means. Wherever this was not the purpose, Allah spoke in relation to His knowledge without means, using the present or past tense. However, since man cannot gain knowledge of these matters without means and before it occurs, it is impossible for them to know of it, they gauged the knowledge of Allah in relation to their own and understood Allah's usage of the future tense to mean that this knowledge is still to be gained (by Allah). Thus, they are left confused, since Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ says:

اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عِلْمًا

Allah has encompassed all things in knowledge.[1]

which indicates that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has complete knowledge of everything since eternity, while other verses indicate that knowledge of certain things are gained later such as:

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰی نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِیْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِیْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ

And We will surely test you until We make evident those who strive among you [for the cause of Allah] and the patient, and We will test your affairs.[2]

However, those of understanding and those acquainted with the point mentioned above know that the knowledge referred to in both instances is the same to Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12.

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31.

The concepts of *maḥw* (erasing) and *ithbāt* (confirmation) in the two Divine records

It would only be appropriate at this juncture, to mention the explanation of the verse:

يَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيُثْبِتُ

Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms.[1]

A discussion for which objective Shīʿī scholars might have been waiting in anticipation. Let us first view the verse in its entirety, thereafter my own thoughts will also be set forth. The entire verse runs as follows:

وَمَا كَانَ لِرَسُوْلٍ اَنْ يَّاْتِىَ بِاٰيَةٍ اِلَّا بِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ ؕ لِكُلِّ اَجَلٍ كِتَابٌ يَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيُثْبِتُ ۖ وَعِنْدَهٗۤ اُمُّ الْكِتٰبِ

And it was not for a messenger to come with a sign except by permission of Allah. For every term is a decree. Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book.[2]

The essence of this verse is that no Messenger can produce a miracle as a sign of his nubuwwah except with divine sanction. For every period there are separate written commands of which He erases whatever He wishes, and retains what He wants. While with Him there exists another greater set of written commands which is the source of all.

That much is the purport of the verse. After duly noting that there is reference to two separate written commands; one for every period and a source in Allah's possession, and that erasing and confirmation are mentioned in relation to the first only, men of understanding would realize:

- There are two distinct Divine records- the greater record, referred to as Umm al-Kitāb and the lesser record to which the phrase: "Every period has written commands" refers to.

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39.

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 38, 39.

- The acts of erasing and confirmation apply exclusively to the lesser record and not to the greater one.

This is precisely the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They too believe that there can be no addition to or deduction from the greater record, which is either in accordance with Allah's Knowledge, or is itself His Knowledge.

Badā' is justifiable from the Qur'ān only in the same manner that the prohibition of ṣalāh may be proven from the verse: "Do not approach ṣalāh..."

On which fine aspect do the Shī'ah then raise the claim that badā' is justified in the Qur'ān? If it is from this verse that they substantiate their claim, then it would be no different from the fool who claimed that he does not pray ṣalāh because Allah forbids ṣalāh in the Qur'ān. Someone asked him: "Sir, show us this too. We have never heard this. If this is indeed the case, then there would be great ease." The fool replied: "Is it not mentioned in Sūrah al-Nisā': "Do not come close to prayer." He was then told: "But the verse goes on to say: "...when you are intoxicated." The verse must be practiced in its entirety." The fool in turn replied: "Hey! who has ever practiced on the whole text? It is already a lot just to practice just this much!" ... So perhaps the scholars of the Shī'ah invoke a similar rule here.

On a lighter note, there may be a different excuse for the Shī'ah. It might just be that they only knew the verse up to the point where it says: "*For every term is a decree. Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms.*" It was then by their total submission and complete adherence that they were led to this belief. As such, it would actually be praiseworthy. But if they knew the part of the verse which says: "*And with Him is the Mother of all Books*", and still they held a belief different from that of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it would be worthy of condemnation.

Allah is indeed Pure! All these claims of competing with the Ahl al-Sunnah in understanding the Qur'ān and on the Qur'ān being preserved but:

موشي بخواب اندر بيرون زشهر شود

In a dream it seems wonderful but the reality is quite different

Most arguments of the Shī'ah belong to the same genre as that of the fool. The manner in which they recall verses from the Qur'ān is no different from that

depicted in a couplet wherein the poet Mirza Noshā describes the effect of sectarian affiliation:

لا تقربوا الصلاة زنهیم بخاطر است وز امر یاد ماند کلوا واشربوا مرا

The order, do not approach salāh appeals to the heart

And the order to eat and drink is all that is acted upon

Divine knowledge is pre-eternal, immutable and all encompassing

The truth is that divine knowledge does not undergo any change. How could there be when the very thought is dispelled by Allah every step of the way in words such as:

وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ عَلِيْمًا حَكِيْمًا

Allah is All Knowing, All Wise.[1]

وَ كَانَ اللّٰهُ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عَلِيْمًا

Allah has knowledge of all things.[2]

وَكُنَّا بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عٰلِمِيْنَ

We have knowledge of all things.[3]

وَّ اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عِلْمًا

Unquestionably He is, of all things, encompassing.[4]

وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ مُّحِيْطًا

And ever is Allah, of all things, encompassing.[5]

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 111

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 40

3 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 81

4 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12.

5 Sūrah al-Nisā': 126

The Knowledge of Allah encompasses all things pre-eternally. The only way in which a mistake could be perceived to occur is for something to come between Allah and what He knows. Were such an idea even to arise, it would be refuted by several verses of the Qur'ān, where Allah describes Himself as "اقرب" (*closest*).

Should the Shīʿah suggest that (Allah forbid) there could be interruption of Allah's capabilities then such brazenness could only ever be mustered by the Shīʿah. That aside, it is a verse of the Qur'ān and not the mutterings of some priest; Allah says:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَخْفٰى عَلَيْهِ شَىْءٌ فِى الْاَرْضِ وَلَا فِى السَّمَآءِ

Indeed, from Allah nothing is hidden in the earth nor in the heaven.[1]

Badā' ascribes compound ignorance to Allah

Despite the fact that the scholars of the Shīʿah generally possess some command of the rational disciplines, they do not seem to understand that incorrect knowledge is not really knowledge, but rather a form of ignorance that is referred to as 'Compound Ignorance' (*Jahl Murakkab*). This technical term is known even to the illiterate, let alone students of the advanced texts in logic. It is in fact a very common saying that simple ignorance (*Jahl Basīṭ*) is better than compound ignorance (*Jahl Murakkab*). Be that as it may, the charge of compound ignorance directed by these people against the Most Sacred and Sublime Being is such that in the first place it amounts to the effective abrogation of the previously mentioned verses. Allah is indeed Pure! A mere human abrogating the words of Allah and then too in a matter of belief, which by consensus of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah, and the ummah at large for that matter, lies beyond the reach of abrogation. Secondly, between Allah Most High and compound ignorance there exists simply no relation. Absolved is Allah from all such fallacious attributions.

Badā' gives all entities in existence a degree of superiority over Allah

Thirdly, inanimate objects which do not have any knowledge, and all entities in existence for that matter, become in one sense superior to Allah. That is because all things besides Allah suffer some degree of simple ignorance while there is no simple ignorance with Allah. The verses cited made it clear that Allah has knowledge of

1 Surah Āl ʿImrān: 5.

all things. If that knowledge now turns out to be incorrect, it results in a case of compound ignorance, compared to which simple ignorance is better. In this case, all things in existence gain a degree of superiority over Allah. Allah is indeed Pure! What a way to recognize the greatness of Allah!

The entire world is the divine record of erasing and confirmation

The question may now be asked as to which is that record wherein erasing and confirmation occurs. Since it is already known to us that it is something other than the Knowledge of Allah, there is no real need to answer this question. However, since there is certainly merit in setting the mind at ease, we submit that the reality of these things is known only to Allah and those whom Allah grants knowledge thereof. It thus devolves upon us to proffer a possible and conceivable explanation. What this unworthy writer has come to understand from the discussions of the learned elders is that the entire world is the divine record in which some things may be conceived of as the paper and others can be understood as the symbols and letters.

An example to explain erasure and confirmation

To further understand this, here is one example. Wax or any similar pliable substance can be shaped into any form — round or elongated — but at any one given time that wax can assume only one particular shape; it cannot have two forms simultaneously. The first shape will cease to exist when the second shape takes form. However, since forms are a type of engraving, they may be understood as letters and symbols, with the wax itself being the paper.

Once this example has settled into the mind, then understand further. The metamorphosis of shapes and states appears in all physical entities. The crop that grows forth from the earth is constituted of parts of that same earth. Under divine care it changes from its first shape. The crop then undergoes several changes until it assumes the form of food. In reality, this food is that same original earth that has now come into the form of food. It goes into the stomach and becomes something else, and passing through the stage of semen it turns into something different altogether. In the same way, look at all other physical substances. Heat and cold, and all other changes are part of the same phenomenon. The soul too, undergoes the same type of change in condition; sadness, happiness, fear and safety.

Thus, those things that undergo these constant changes may be understood to be the letters and symbols of the divine record, while the physical substances and non-physical souls, which like the wax, remain present constantly throughout the processes of change, are the pages of that record. Understand now that those shapes that have given way to other shapes have been erased as such, while the new shapes which have taken the place of the old ones have been confirmed. Those acquainted with Arabic and Persian would recognize that the word "*Ithbāt*" (confirmation) is commonly used to denote the act of writing.

Amazing explanation of "*For every term is a decree*"

Since every shape requires a certain time limit within which to subsist, Allah says: "*For every term is a decree.*" This means that every length of time has its own distinct inscription. When that length of time expires and the time arrives for other inscriptions, other shapes and states take their place and the earlier shapes are obliterated, and the inscriptions for the new period are written onto the pages. The pages, however, are not such that they are polluted or contaminated by the erasure of earlier shapes. Rather, just as one erases what he had written earlier in a book or on a slate or wooden board, and writes something else in its place, in the same way Allah inscribes onto these pages what He wishes and then erases it in accordance to His Will.

The Umm al-Kitāb explained through an example

The copies, or rather, prototypes of all former and latter shapes are contained within a larger book. The student learning geometric shapes draws each shape on his slate, and when the time comes to learn a new shape, he erases the old one and inscribes the new shape onto his slate. The prototypes of all these shapes however, are preserved in the text books of Geometry.

Accordingly, the manner in which this verse connects coherently with what precedes it is as follows:

> How can a prophet produce a miracle of his own accord? With Us there are fixed and determined inscriptions for every period that cannot be increased or decreased. Thus, no one can — by his own whim — bring about a miraculous sign.

Badā' is untenable since there is no erasure in Allah's knowledge

The fair-minded should duly note the coherence of this discussion. All said and done, there remains no space within which to accommodate badā', so those who advocate this belief are left at a loss to substantiate their claims. It is therefore untenable to say that since the verse contains mention of erasure and confirmation, there must be erasure and confirmation within Allah's knowledge.

Another example to explain the Umm al-Kitāb, erasure and confirmation

However, minds tend to rush towards such ideas firmly entrenched within them. To a hungry person, two plus two will always be not just four but four loaves of bread. It is thus not inconceivable for the above discussion to be countered with the contention that it is commonly known that the writing which this verse mentions is the act usually perceived to be scripting. It applies therefore to those symbols and letters which represent words or speech. The reply to this, in the first place, is that being commonly known is by no means a criterion of correctness. Such an argument can only be raised against an inconsistent and unsuitable claim.

However, in spite of that, we will also venture down this road. Most people would have seen that shopkeepers keep a record of their daily business on a slate, and that they later transfer that record to a ledger and wash the slate clean. Thereafter they write the takings of the next day on that same slate. Thus, writing and erasing takes place on a daily basis, while all of it is recorded in the ledger, which is never erased. In a similar manner should the infinite knowledge of Allah be understood. The daily actions are recorded on a slate, the entire generation upon that one slate, after which it is transcribed to the main ledger, which is called the Umm al-Kitāb. Thereafter, the actions of a new generation are recorded on that slate and later transcribed to the ledger. For example, the actions of those living in the era of The Prophet ﷺ are recorded on the slate and then at the end of this era transcribed to the ledger or Umm al-Kitāb. Thereafter the slate is wiped clean and the actions of those living in the next generation of the Ṣaḥābah are recorded and then transcribed to the ledger once that era has ended. In this manner, erasing and confirmation continues through the ages but it is obvious to all that this erasure is not on account of any error, which may prove the concept of badā'.

If we accept that *maḥw wa ithbāt* refers to the erasure and confirmation in *ahkām* (laws), then too this is a sign of intelligence, and in no way does it constitute badā'

If we momentarily — for arguments sake — accept that what we have just explained is not the case, rather this erasure and confirmation is due to the changes in the *aḥkām* (laws), then too the claim of the Shī'ah cannot be proven.

Let us take an example: A sick person goes to the doctor who, according to the medical books and journals, prescribes a certain type of medication for him. After a while, the doctor alters his medication, he reduces some and adds others. After some time again he puts the patient onto some other treatment.

This was all done according to the medical laws and protocols found in the medical books, since the doctor understood that after the first round of treatment has taken effect, the patient will need to clear his system of the remains of that medications, therefore the second prescription was prescribed, then he will need to now make up for the loss of energy and strengthen the body and therefore the third type of medications, etc., are required.

This change in prescription was not because the doctor erred the first time and now needed to correct his mistake. In fact, this shows the deep understanding, intelligence and expertise of the doctor, that each medication was prescribed, according to the medical laws and rules documented in the medical books or journals, on its appropriate time.

If you have understood this, then in the same light understand the system of the creation of Allāh.

For the sake of understanding this example, think of the Creator, Allāh سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ who is Most Wise, as the experienced, expert doctor. Picture the Umm al-Kitāb as the medical books and journals, picture لِكُلِّ اَجَلٍ كِتَابٌ (*For every term is a decree*), which is in the Umm al-Kitāb, as the various different prescriptions, picture the angels as the nurses and those taking care and administering the medication to the sick, and finally picture the entire world as the patient.

Understand the *maḥw wa ithbāt* as the various different prescriptions and medications.

Now if these changes are understood to be badā', as explained by the Shīʿah, then this is the height of foolishness.

Yes, if the change in prescription was because initially the doctor prescribed some medication which he later realized is not having an effect, and changed the medication due to his earlier error, then this could be classified as badā'.

However, this scenario is not possible here, since the second portion of the verse states: "*For every term is a decree*", which means that in every time and era there are a different set of laws, and the change therefore is because of the change in time and era, not because of an earlier mistake.

In short, the three explanations given above are interwoven and interlinked, and after understanding and pondering over it, none of the proponents of badā' will have the courage to even think of, let alone present this verse in support of their doctrine of badā'.

However, many a time we find that there is no benefit in putting the truth before a person whose heart is bereft of justice. Anyhow, those who understood have understood, and those who have not understood, may Allah grant them the understanding.

The third proof presented by the Shīʿah in support of the concept of badā'

Some Shīʿah scholars have presented a new proof to support their concept of badā'. They attempt to prove this concept it by presenting the verse:

وَ وٰعَدْنَا مُوْسٰى ثَلٰثِيْنَ لَيْلَةً وَّ اَتْمَمْنٰهَا بِعَشْرٍ فَتَمَّ مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖۤ اَرْبَعِيْنَ لَيْلَةً

We will now analyse this assertion. First, understand the meaning of this verse:

> *And We made an appointment with Moses for thirty nights and perfected them by [the addition of] ten; so, the term of his Lord was completed as forty nights.*[1]

1 Surah al-Aʿrāf: 142.

Now we will examine the conclusion the Shīʿah from this verse. They assert:

> Allah first promised to reveal the Tawrāh after thirty nights of effort, but after thirty nights had passed the Tawrāh was still not given. Instead, he was instructed to add another ten nights. The only reason that comes to mind is that after thirty nights of solitude had passed, Allah found it inappropriate that such a great recompense or award (i.e. the Tawrāh) be given in lieu of such a short period, so the duration was increased to emphasise the greatness of the award going to be given.
>
> So, if we say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ was not aware of this from before, then this is badā', as explained by the earlier Shīʿī scholars, otherwise, at the least we can say is that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ knew of it, but he promised Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِٱلسَّلَامُ and the Banū Isrā'īl something else.
>
> Although there is a large difference between these two possibilities mentioned above, according to us there is no difference between badā' as per the explanation of the earlier Shīʿī scholars and the *towriyah* (insinuation) of Allah.
>
> So, in conclusion, we cannot trust and rely on the word of Allah. Therefore, if we find praises for the Ṣaḥābah or any of the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the Qur'ān, it matters not. We cannot rely on it.

(Here ends the proof of the Shīʿah.)

Answer 1

One needs to first understand that there is a major difference between the mistake made by the speaker and the misunderstanding of the listener. The Shīʿah ascribe their misunderstanding to Allah and conclude that Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ made a mistake (Allah forbid). What they do not realise is that their misunderstanding is a fault on their part, not a fault on the part of Allah.

Everyone is aware that this incident has been mentioned here in brief. No mention is made here about fasting and of the miswāk, but we find mention of it in the books of ḥadīth and tafsīr; where it explains that it was not a mere matter of spending thirty or forty days, but it was actually to fast for this duration. In a similar manner, it is possible that there were some other conditions attached which have not been mentioned, such as to use the miswāk.

Even if we do assume that from other narrations it is proven that the 'payment' for the Tawrāh was only thirty days of fasting, without any other condition attached to it, then not considering that it is impossible to prove, because the most that can be said is that there is no mention of any other condition (referred to as *ʿAdm al-Thubūt*), but to prove that there was no other condition (*Thubūt al-ʿAdm*) is impossible.

First example

The explanation of the above is as follows, there are many conditions which are not explicitly mentioned at the time of stipulating the payment or wages, but are understood to be there.

For example, a person working for the court or in the army. It is not mentioned at the time of stipulating the wages, etc., that he will have to wear a certain uniform, obey all the rules of the court or army, but at the same time, if he leaves out any of these things, he will be reprimanded, fined or even punished.

If someone says that you cannot make an analogy on those working for the king, because there is no mention made of the work to be done nor of the remuneration he will receive. Only one thing is mentioned which everyone knows (i.e. service to the king), as for other matters like the uniform etc., that is also understood. So, although nothing has been mentioned, everything forms part of the original agreement.

Our answer to this is that this actually proves our point. You mentioned that everything has not been mentioned, but due to it being understood as a condition, it still forms part of the agreement. Thus, this will be more so when only a few things need to be understood. In this case there is no need to clearly spell each condition out, and still, it will form part of the agreement.

Second example

If you are not satisfied with this example, then here is another example.

You hire a horse to go somewhere. At the time of the agreement there is no mention of the reigns, saddle, fodder, etc., but if the owner of the horse gives you a horse without the above mentioned things, you will argue with him for not giving you what is due to you.

Similarly understand that if between Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ and his special slaves, more so the Ambiyā', there are certain rules and guidelines pertaining to manners and etiquette, which are known and understood by these special servants. There will be some sort of action taken if these are left out, even though these are not clearly mentioned or spelled out it is still required.

However, this will not be termed as badā'. It could only be called badā' if the Ambiyā' had no knowledge about it. If they were aware of it, and then due to human weakness they omitted some of it, then this can never be termed badā'.

Answer 2

The above explanation was based on us accepting what the Shī'ah said about adding another ten nights, that it was an increase in the 'payment'. The reality of the matter is that only this much is mentioned in the verse:

> Allah promised to give Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِالسَّلَام the Tawrāh on completion of thirty days of sacrifice and effort.

Let us look at an example:

You hired a person to work for one month for a stipulated wage. This means that this stipulated wage will be given to him if he works for one month, whether you give him his wage on the thirtieth day or after that.

Similarly, the Tawrāh was promised on completion of thirty days of sacrifice. This means that the fruits of thirty days of sacrifice will be the Tawrāh, whether it will be given on the thirtieth day or thereafter is a separate matter.

Now the reason for why ten days of additional sacrifice and effort was taken from Nabī Musa عَلَيْهِالسَّلَام is definitely not our responsibility to explain.

Dispelling a doubt

If someone of shallow understanding decides to use the word "اَتْمَمْنٰهَا" (We completed) to make the argument that we understand from this word that the ten extra days was a *tatimmah* (completion) and a part of the thirty, then we have an answer for him as well.

It is clearly mentioned in the aḥādīth that the sunnah and nafl ṣalāh are a *tatimmah* (completion) of the farḍ ṣalāh. Similarly, Ṣadaqah al-Fiṭr is a tatimmah of the fast

of Ramaḍān. Yet no one draws the conclusion from here that the amount of farḍ ṣalāh has increased.

What it implies is that due to human weakness there is always some shortfall or shortcoming in every action, even though one tries one's level best to render. Thus, the tatimmah is put into place to cover up for these shortfalls and shortcomings.

The original amount of the act still remains the same in the knowledge of Allah and according to us.

In a similar manner one should understand the ten extra days.

In fact, the word "اَتْمَمْنٰهَا" (We completed) itself indicates that this these ten days were to make up for any shortfalls, although the original promised amount was still thirty.

If the sacrifice and effort of these thirty days were from all angles accepted and there were no shortfalls (which arise due to human weakness, of which no person, not even a nabī or walī, saint, is free from) then there would not have been the directive to spend another ten days.

Another doubt which could arise, is that from the word "مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖ" (the appointed time of his Rabb) someone could say that this indicates that the entire forty days was the actual period.

The answer to this is that there is a stipulated 'price' for every action, and for each 'price' there is a certain stipulated amount of effort. There are ample verses and aḥādīth which prove this point.

The stipulated 'price' for attaining such a great thing as the Tawrāh was actually forty nights, but due to the generosity, favour and all-encompassing Mercy of Allah سُبْحَانَهٗوَتَعَالٰى, He gave a concession to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِالسَّلَامُ and reduced it to thirty nights.

This is akin to how nine-tenths concession has been given to the general masses of this ummah, as is mentioned in this verse:

مَنْ جَآءَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ فَلَه عَشْرُ اَمْثَالِهَا

Whoever comes [on the Day of Judgement] with a good deed will have ten times the like thereof [to his credit].[1]

1 Surah al-Anʿām: 160.

So, it will be said that he got the reward of ten good deeds in lieu of only one good deed, so there is a concession of nine-tenths of effort.

There are many other aḥādīth which indicate the same meaning, and there are also certain verses and aḥādīth which give even greater concession to certain individuals. Due to fear of lengthening this treatise, we will suffice with what has been said.

The gist of what has been discussed above is that initially, due to the favour of Allah Taʿālā, a concession of ten days was given to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, but then due to human weakness, this was not done to such a degree of perfection which was required to be given the Tawrāh, rather there was some sort of shortfall, which was compensated for by the extra ten days.

So due to His infinite Grace and Mercy the entire thirty days of effort was not rejected due to the shortfall, although if Allah Taʿālā wished there was a valid reason to do so. Instead, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى instructed another ten days be added so that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام would be successful and achieve his objective. In this way he would not return empty handed and saddened to his people. Forty days were thus completed, and it was said: *so, the term of his Lord was completed as forty nights.*

In other words, the period which is normally demanded (before concession is given) to attain these special favours was eventually been completed.

Answer 3

Sometimes there are certain actions which carry no real importance in the court of Allah and no emphasis is laid upon it, but when a special servant of Allah, under certain circumstances, carries out that deed with such sincerity due to some need at that time then Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى accepts this action in such a way that it is now made part of other actions on account of the level of humility, submissiveness, and servitude it was carry out with. Thereafter everyone is also commanded or asked to carry out this action.

Allah orders this to highlight his appreciation of that action and to expose the status of his servant to the world.

To further understand this, look at the example of Hājar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Everyone knows the incident of how she ran between Ṣafā and Marwā in search of water. This act of

running between Ṣafā and Marwā, in itself does not constitute an act of ibādah, but now it has been included in the sunan or wājibāt of ḥajj.

In the same token, the duration of forty nights was not something of importance in the sight of Allah, it was only the usual thirty nights which were given special virtue. But when Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ carried out those forty nights of exertion and effort on that specific occasion, due to the need of the hour, then on account of the great level of sincerity; Allah Taʿālā accepted it in such a way that from that moment onwards, the period of forty days was stipulated as the period one has to complete to attain virtue.

When this specific number (forty) has now been awarded a special status in the court of Allah, then the verse: *so, the term of his Lord was completed as forty nights*, will mean that the normal duration to achieve these special favours was thirty; but since Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ completed forty nights of exertion and effort with such a great deal of sincerity, Allah Taʿālā has now accepted this action due to his sincerity to such an extent that now the period of forty nights has been stipulated for gaining closeness to Allah Taʿālā.

The difference between this explanation and the one before it is quite apparent, so there is no need for further elaboration. However, we will render a conclusion to this lengthy discussion.

Conclusion: Badā' constitutes speaking lies

An unbiased person will come to the conclusion that badā' will only be proven from this verse in one of the following two instances:

1. Allah, who is the Knower of the unseen, promised to grant the Tawrāh to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ after thirty days, but had absolutely no idea of the forty nights at that time and only coincidently, due to some unforeseen reason, changed His former intention and instead of granting the Tawrāh after thirty nights, bestowed it only after forty nights.

2. Allah, who is the Knower of the apparent and hidden, knew that the Tawrāh will only be given after forty days, but He intentionally informed Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ that it will be given after thirty days. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was convinced that he will receive the Tawrāh after thirty days, but Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ knew something else, and therefore he only received it after forty days.

In this second instance, although there is no defect in the knowledge and intention of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, it is not free from deceit.

This point had to be brought here, because some of the 'research scholars' of the Shīʿah try to explain badā' in such a manner that there will be some defect in the *ikhbār* (informing), but no blemish or defect will be attached to the *ʿilm* (knowledge) and *irādah* (intention) of Allah.

Those who are aware of the grandeur and greatness of Allah Taʿālā, fully understand that not a single quality of Allah, whether it be ʿilm, irādah, or any other quality for that matter; all are free from any type of defection or blemish.

The above mentioned 'research scholar' was pleased with himself when he chose this explanation. He thought that by doing so the Ahl al-Sunnah will not be able to object against him, since the ʿilm and irādah of Allah has been declared to be free from any defect or blemish, but the poor chap did not realise that by this explanation, another defect was ascribed to another quality of Allah.

Badā' in the ʿilm of Allah does not arise due to the misunderstanding of the listener

Nevertheless, according to the explanation tendered by the Shīʿah, whichever of these two cases are assumed, it necessitates badā'.

However, if we assume another case, then there is no scope for establishing badā' from this verse. That is, we say that this was a work agreement. In other words, on completion of a certain work, a stipulated remuneration would be awarded, and this comprised of the fulfilling of certain conditions, which if not fulfilled will result in the remuneration being withheld. Similarly, if the work is not up to the required standard then too the remuneration be withheld.

If this was the agreement, then the Tawrāh not being given after thirty days but only after the period was extended, will not imply any mistake on the part of Allah, which could be translated as badā'.

Yes, no doubt, misunderstanding of the listener can take place, and even the Ambiyā, who are *maʿsūm* (infallible), are not maʿsūm from misunderstandings. So, if Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ misunderstood something then even though we (the Ahl al-Sunnah) will not say that this is his mistake, we will say that it has nothing to do with badā'.

If misunderstanding of the listener is taken to be badā', then the Ahl al-Sunnah- who vehemently reject the concept of badā', will be regarded as proponents of badā', since this type of so-called badā' is found in abundance according to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The Ahl al-Sunnah regard the differences amongst the Imāms as a great blessing, and these differences are caused by one misunderstanding something, yet this is not termed badā'.

In short, badā' means that the speaker (who in this case is Allah) himself misunderstands something, as per the belief of the earlier Shī'ah scholars, or that the speaker intentionally says the incorrect thing, as per the interpretation of some of the 'research scholars' of our time. Badā' in no way means that the listener, whether a Nabī or a scholar or even anyone else misunderstands something. This is rather termed as an error in ijtihād or a misunderstanding or a shortcoming in understanding. There is no link between this and badā'.

If some person of shallow understanding understands this to be badā' then he will be regarded as excused until the truth settles upon his mind, although in these matters ignorance should not be an excuse, especially after the truth has been expounded and the proofs put forward in such a manner that there remains no scope to reject it. In this case, an error of this nature is regarded as a grave mistake. May Allah protect us from this type of misunderstanding.

An important point to remember is where there is some scope for errors in ijtihād, it only applies to those areas where there are no *muḥkam* and *ibārat al-Naṣ* (categorical statements). In muḥkam and ibārat al-Naṣ there is no scope for exercising ijtihād. If anybody errs in these categorical aspects, then he is an ignorant man and not a man of knowledge.

In conclusion, we say that any person who recites the Qur'ān is well aware that the verses mentioning the virtues of the Ṣaḥabah are categorical in this regard. If still a person does not understand, then only Allah can make him understand.

Two other explanations of this verse and the complete uprooting of the badā' dogma

The words thirty nights is either *maf'ūl bihī* or *maf'ūl fīhī*.

In the first case, where it is *maf'ūl bihī*, it means that the promised duration was the thirty nights. In other words, come to Mount Ṭūr, we wish to honour you by allowing you to carry out thirty nights of special ʿibādah. This promise was fulfilled, wherein Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was allowed thirty nights of special ʿibādah. Thereafter Allah Taʿālā from His side favoured Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام by increasing the period and extending it to forty. This can be said to be similar to وَلَدَيْنَا مَزِيْدٌ (extra bounties, over and above the promised amount) or a bonus.

When the general masses of the ummah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are given a ninety percent bonus, why are the Shīʿah so upset that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is given a one third bonus?

In this instance, the awarding of the Tawrāh has nothing to do with this promise. The Tawrāh was either an extra bonus, similar to وَلَدَيْنَا مَزِيْدٌ or the Tawrāh was promised to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as a separate independent promise, which was not attached to the thirty nights. In other words, it was not to say that the thirty nights was a pre-condition for receiving the Tawrāh.

In short, what has been promised in this verse is the ʿibādah of thirty nights. The awarding of the Tawrāh, upon which the whole badā' doctrine is based, has not been mentioned at all.

In the second case, where the words *thirty nights* is taken to be a *maf'ūl fīhī*, it would mean that the promises of Allah continued for thirty days. No mention is made of what was promised. If we accept that the promised item was the Tawrāh, then too it does not affect us in any way, and if the promised entity was something other than the Tawrāh, then obviously there is also no problem.

The verse means that initially for the first thirty days Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was receiving promises and glad tidings, since one month is regarded as a lengthy period of time amongst people, that is why most contracts are also enacted for a month. So, after receiving glad tiding for a month, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was satisfied and consoled, thereafter, to put him at greater ease, another ten days of glad tidings were given. So, although the promises continued for forty days, it was not mentioned: "We continued to promise Mūsā for forty nights." Rather this form of expression was used: "*We continued to promise him for thirty nights and thereafter we completed it by adding another ten nights.*"

Whichever meaning is taken, there is absolutely no mention that initially a time was stipulated for something to be given, and thereafter when the time came, the duration was increased. If this was the case, then the proponents of badā' would have had something to clutch onto. This is quite apparent.

It should be remembered that this explanation we have written at the end was keeping in line with the famous saying: tit for tat, and only mentioned as an argumentative point with the opponent, otherwise the truth itself is manifest to the seeker of the truth.

Conclusion on the discussion of badā'

The Shīʿah claim that badā' took place, and in order to prove it they present this verse which they assume to be a proof for their claim. People of understanding know that the proof must coincide with the claim in such a way that there is no possibility for a meaning contrary to the claim. If such a possibility which is contrary to the claim exists, then too to such an extent that it is not just a mere possibility but rather much more appropriate and fitting than the claim, more so if contrary to the claim is directly understood from it, and there are other proofs which substantiate the contrary and reject the claim made; then an intelligent person will never accept such a claim, rather he will regard the contrary to be true.

And this is exactly the case here. It is not hidden from people of understanding.

By the favour of Allah, we have completely uprooted the concept of badā' and by doing so, we have also answered those people who proffer the excuse of badā'.

When in the Qur'ān mention is made of the virtues of the three Khulafā', the Muhājirīn, and the Anṣār, and the great promises made to them by Allah Taʿālā are enumerated, then these people use the excuse of badā' and say that these praises were mentioned by mistake, and only thereafter Allah Taʿālā came to know the actual state of the Ṣaḥābah.

Since we have proven the falsehood of the badā' concept, there remains no need for us to bring forth the statements of their own Imāms that prove badā' to be unacceptable.

Discussion on the Imāms possessing knowledge of *ʿilm al-ghayb* (knowledge of the unseen)

To add salt to the wound, we say that if their Imāms — who (according to them) possessed knowledge of what transpired and what is going to transpire — have praised the Khulafā' or the Ṣaḥābah, then there is no scope for any doubt (since they are free from badā').

Subḥān Allah! They are not at ease and are not convinced with the speech of Allah, but are convinced and at ease with the statements of the Imāms!

First of all, there are hundreds of verses which prove that besides Allah Taʿālā, no one else possesses knowledge of the unseen. To put them at ease, we will mention a few of these verses:

وَمَا تَدْرِىْ نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا

And no soul perceives what it will earn tomorrow.[1]

In this verse, there is no exception, therefore every soul, whether that of an imām or non-imām, is equal in his ignorance of what is to happen tomorrow.

قُلْ لَّا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِى السَّمٰوٰتِ وَ الْاَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ

Say, "None in the heavens and earth knows the unseen except Allah, and they do not perceive when they will be resurrected."[2]

By accepting that the Imāms have knowledge of the past and future, one has to accept that they equal Allah in knowledge

Furthermore, if one accepts that the Imāms have knowledge of the past and future, one has to accept that they are equal to Allah in knowledge, whereas Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى mentions in Sūrah Yūsuf:

وَفَوْقَ كُلِّ ذِىْ عِلْمٍ عَلِيْمٌ

Over every possessor of knowledge is one [more] knowing.[3]

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 34

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 65.

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 76.

If one were to object and say that this verse informs us that there must be someone who has more knowledge than Allah also, since it has mentioned as a rule that: *Over every possessor of knowledge is one [more] knowing*, without any distinction between Allah and others.

We would reply that first of all people of understanding do not regard this objection as worthy of answering, and secondly, if we accept that it requires answering then who is not aware that intelligence demands that Allah Taʿālā be automatically exempted.

Look at just this one verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَىْءٍ قَدِيْرٌ

Verily Allah has power over all things.

Up to this day, no fool has ever said that if Allah has power over everything then he will have the power to destroy Himself or to create a partner for Himself. Everyone understands that Allah Taʿālā has the power of creating and removing life from the Ambiyā' and the Imāms. In a similar manner, even the most ignorant of people do not understand from this verse: "*Over every possessor of knowledge is one [more] knowing.*" that there is someone more knowledgeable than Allah. Therefore, if anyone brings about such an argument, then it can only be said to be on account of his ignorance and prejudice.

An exceptional point

Despite this, the wording of the verse itself has an indication to the answer. Also, in the verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَىْءٍ قَدِيْرٌ

Verily Allah has power over all things.

the word "شيء" (all things) has an indication to the answer of the aforementioned apprehension as well. The explanation of this is that the words "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) and "عليم" (knowledgeable) even though seem to have the same meaning, "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) has the added meaning of the

person being the bearer of knowledge (and knowledge being a completely separate entity from him) because the connection of *iḍhāfah* (possession) necessitates them being separate entities. On the other hand, the word "عليم" (knowledgeable) does not have this added feature. Therefore, since the knowledge of Allah, according to all is not a separate entity (but rather his inherent attribute), it would not be appropriate to label Him as "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) especially according to the Shīʿah. Rather he should be called "عليم" (knowledgeable), just as the word "شيء" is used for those things which are subject to the will of Allah and not for Allah Himself. In summary, just as the Being of Allah does not fall under the ambit of those things subject to His will, in a similar manner Allah is not referred to by the term "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge), and above whom there is a more knowledgeable being.

In essence, nobody is equal to Allah Taʿālā in knowledge. Just as he is unique in His Being (*dhāt*), similarly He is unique in His Qualities (*sifāt*). Neither the Ambiyā', A'immah, Angels, jinn, people of status nor the general public are equal to him in knowledge. With regards to this belief the Shīʿah are so extreme that they are similar to the Christians in their belief of the divinity of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. The similitude of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has mentioned, namely:

> Your similitude to ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is that one group will be destroyed in their extreme love for you whilst another in their extreme hatred for you.

This likeness and similitude became apparent in the form of the Khawārij, who harboured deep hatred for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the Shīʿah, whose extreme love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has led them to place him above the ranks of the Ambiyā' and even made him a deity. In fact, they surpassed the Christians as well (and portrayed a picture of "ولدينا مزيد"— and we have excelled you). The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had mentioned this specifically regarding ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only. The Shīʿah have not only rendered true this prophecy of The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but have exceeded it as well. The Khawārij have not rendered such depiction of its accuracy as the Shīʿah have. The Khawārij did not go to the same extremes in hatred as the Shīʿah did in their love. How true is the proverbial saying:

> A literate enemy is better than an illiterate friend.

Hypothetically, if we prove that the A'immah possessed complete knowledge of the past and future, the fear of badā' still remains

If we were to accept that the A'immah had complete knowledge of the past and future, then too the fear and apprehension of badā' taking place in the knowledge of Allah would still linger. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who is the most knowledgeable and superior of all the other A'immah himself has been quoted in a narration of *al-Kāfī* and *al-ʿAmālī* of al-Ṣadūq:

> لولا آيّة في كتاب الله لأخبرتكم بما يكون إلى يوم القيامة يريد بالآيّة قوله يمحو الله ما يشاء ويثبت
>
> The summation of the above quotation from *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī and *al-ʿAmālī* of al-Ṣadūq is that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:
>
> If it were not for one verse of the Quran (viz. "Allah erases whatever He wills and keeps in place (whatever He wills"), I would have informed you of all to take place until the Day of Qiyāmah.

This is the crux of the narration. If one were to ponder over this deeply then the very proof of the A'immah having complete knowledge of the past and future itself proves that their knowledge does not exceed the knowledge of Allah. Thus, the very reason which renders the knowledge of Allah uncertain (i.e. badā') has the same effect upon the knowledge of the A'immah. They too were wary of badā' taking place and thus had no reliance and contentment in their knowledge. This thought might be a means of intense grief for the Shīʿah, that their entire religion has been washed down the drain; because if the A'immah themselves had no reliance upon their knowledge, what reliance can there be upon a religion centered upon their knowledge?

We too are delighted to know that the vulgarities levelled at the first three Khulafā' and the other Muhājirīn and Anṣār from the A'immah, turning a blind eye to the integrity and reliability of those who narrated it (which was discussed previously), are no longer reliable or relevant. The same will apply to everything else narrated in their books which opposes the Ahl al-Sunnah.

One doubt still remains, supposedly if badā' had taken place then too it was to a minimal amount. The response to this would be that even a minimal amount is

sufficient to remove reliance. The Tawrāh and Injīl were interpolated and changed, which discredited and nullified its authenticity, but it was only a few verses and not the entire scripture thereof.

The virtues of the Khulafā' and the Ṣaḥābah in the words of Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the other A'immah

If anyone were to state:

> Whatever was revealed in the Noble Qur'ān regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah or indicates the high ranking of the Khulafā' was revealed before the demise of most of them and thus holds no weight, as consideration is given to the end result. Therefore, there is the possibility of error in the word of Allah. However, that which Amīr al-Mu'minīn or any of the other A'immah said, it was stated after their demise and therefore does not have the possibility of error. Thus, if the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah, and especially the first three Khulafā', are proven from their statements then there is no scope for denial.

Therefore, I will now present the narrations of the A'immah. *Nahj al-Balāghah* of ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī, which is regarded by the Shīʿah to be mutawātir, states that when Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was asked about those who passed away, he mentioned those qualities which denotes their absolute closeness to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. The eloquent narration is quoted below verbatim:

> كانوا إذا ذكروا الله هملت أعينهم حتى تبل جباههم مادوا كما يميد الشجر يوم الريح العاصف خوفا من العقاب ورجاء للثواب

On another occasion he said regarding them:

> كان أحب اللقاء إليهم لقاء الله وإنهم يتقلبون على مثل الجمر من ذكر معادهم

The summary of both these narrations is that the condition of the Ṣaḥābah was such that when they remembered Allah tears flowed from their eyes until it wet their cheeks and they swayed out of fear of Allah and in hope of his reward, as a tree sways on an extremely windy day. They were most desirous of meeting Allah and they tossed and turned with great agitation on the mention of the Hereafter, as if they were rolling on live coals.

A lengthy supplication has also been related from Imām al-Sajjād رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ in *Ṣaḥīfah-e Kāmilah* containing praises of the Ṣaḥābah. Brevity does not allow us to reproduce the entire duʿā and so we will suffice upon a few phrases thereof. The duʿā states:

اللهم وأصحاب محمد خاصة الذين حسنوا الصحابة

It thereafter goes on to say:

فارقوا الأزواج والأولاد في إظهار كلمته وقاتلوا الآباء والأبناء في تثبيت نبوته

Thereafter it asserts:

فلا تنسى لهم اللهم ما تركوا لك وفيك وأرضهم من رضوانك

He then makes mention of the Tābiʿīn with a similar supplication being mentioned for them.

The summary of these words are:

> O Allah! And the companions of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who have fulfilled the right of his companionship; they have left their wives and children for the upliftment of his dīn and have fought their own fathers and sons for the establishment of his nubuwwah, thus, O Allah! Do not overlook their sacrifices for Your sake and bless them with happiness from Your happiness and pleasure from Your pleasure.

This is the crux of the supplication mentioned above, which openly declares the virtue and nobility of the Ṣaḥābah.

The virtues of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq

Now listen to what is proven with regards to the virtues of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The following is narrated in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which according to the Shīʿah is similar to divine revelation:

> عن أمير المؤمنين أنه قال لله بلاد أبي بكر فلقد قوم الأود وداوى العمد وأقام السنة وخلف البدعة ذهب نقي الثوب قليل العيب صاحب خيرها وسبق شرها أدى الى الله طاعته واتقاه بحقه رحل وتركهم في طريق متشعبة لايهتدي فيها الضال ولايستيقن المهتدي

> Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is reported to have said: "For Allah alone is the lands of Abū Bakr[1] (i.e. he possesses great traits bestowed by Allah). By the oath of Allah, he straightened the crookedness, mended the pillar, elevated the sunnah, relegated innovations and he departed from the world with a clean slate. He was blessed with an exceptional reign and passed free of its trying times. He fulfilled his submission to Allah and feared Him as He deserves to be feared. He went away and left the people in dividing ways wherein the misled cannot attain guidance and the guided cannot attain certainty."

This is the summary of the above mentioned sermon.

The discrepancies of ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī which were unsuccessful

Now we would like to bring to the notice of the readers that ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī, to lend favour to denomination, changed the word "Abū Bakr" to "*Fulān*" (someone) so that the Ahl al-Sunnah would not be able to benefit from this narration, which is nothing new at all. However, he did not realise that there would be no benefit in hiding the name. There were only three successors before ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and thus regardless of who was intended, it will most definitely result in an advantageous situation for the Ahl al-Sunnah. Moreover, these are such qualities mentioned herein that fit the personality of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ perfectly, especially the first two qualities which are of such a nature that besides Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ they fit no one else. No other khilāfah had crookedness to contend with and had to rectify a deficiency in one of the pillars of Islam.

Without a doubt, it was Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who had to face the scourge of apostasy which arouse at the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and of people denying the obligation of zakāh, which is one of the pillars of Islam. These trials are synonymous with the name of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It was these blessings, orderly management and successful endeavours that were deeply entrenched in the heart of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and well-known to the Shīʿah, whether they muster the courage to admit it or not. This is what triggered ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to reminisce over the days wherein he witnessed the trials and tribulations unfolding in his era and lamented over the absence of a personality of that calibre.

---

1 Because the land of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was Allah's land, therefore the quality desired by Allah became apparent in it and it is obvious that he who is for Allah will be a possessor of great perfection.

The bravery of al-Ṣiddīq and his steadfastness

Why should it not be such for Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who stood firm at the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ when the scourge of apostasy arose from all sides and the majority of the Ṣaḥābah were left bewildered to such an extent that even ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — who was a mountain of courage, sternness, and deep foresight — was left baffled. It was then that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said to him in order to stir up his unrelenting valour:

أجبار في الجاهلية وخوار في الإسلام

> O ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ! Were you a forceful dictator in the days of kufr but cowardly in Islam?

ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of the opinion that it would be preferable not to despatch the army of Usāmah ibn Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and thus leave Madīnah void of an army, leaving it open to attack. However, it was on account of the courage and steadfastness of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who in the face of all this turmoil was not alarmed, and emphatically stated that how is it possible for me to hesitate regarding that contingent which was prepared by none other than the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?

In a similar manner, when he intended despatching an army against the infidels, which most of the Ṣaḥābah disagreed with, he said that if no one is ready to stand up I will take up arms against them single-handed.

In this instance as well, when it came to those denying the obligation of zakāh and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ held reservations regarding them on account of them proclaiming the kalimah, it was Abu Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ once again who saved the day saying: "I would not hesitate in waging war against he who differentiates between ṣalāh and zakāh by calling one Farḍ and not the other. By the oath of Allah! If they desist from giving even a rope which they discharged in the era of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, I would not think twice in waging war with them."

In short, it was his courage, bravery and farsightedness which prompted him to adopt these stances and thereby preserve dīn in its pristine form, saving it from endless regression and deterioration.

This is why, Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when witnessing the disorder and trials in his era recalled the steadfastness of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is in conformity to

the wording of the sermon itself and these attributes match none other than Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is why most commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* hold the opinion that it refers to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If they still remain obstinate then the most, they are able to do is presume it refers to a personality who passed away in the time of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as was done by some biased commentators. Since it is the duty of the commentators to expound on the meaning as well, we ask why should it refer to this unknown man (who passed away during the lifetime of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) since all achievements in the time of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were his accomplishments and no other can take credit for it. Furthermore, it is impossible that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself was referred to because then why would ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ refer to him as "*fulān*" (someone) How disrespectful would that be that he refers to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in such an unbefitting manner!

Platform of praise is one of exposure and not one of ambiguity

Then too, what prompted him to adopt such a means of concealment and ambiguity in a platform of praise, which is a place of exposure and precision. Instead, considering the fact that this is a platform of praise, it appears to me that this is most definitely appreciation of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and this ambiguity is without a doubt the result of erasure and interpolation of the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah. If this were not the case, then there was no fear in exposing the name of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that would compel one to hide it. If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were implied then it would necessitate concealment (by the Shīʿah) so that these praises should not be awarded to him (even if in the interim, by conferring it to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, one will be accused of hatred and enmity for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). If they are prepared to attribute these qualities to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and thereby accept the accusation of enmity against the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, since this will be the presumed reason for concealing his name, then well and good, on condition these qualities accommodate such attribution. However, to begin with, what would be the meaning of elevating the sunnah and relegating innovations? Ask whosoever you please as to what comes to mind when "elevating the sunnah" is said? It is apparent that elevation only takes place after the presence and decline of a thing, otherwise what will be elevated?

Listen well! Those commands issued by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and those actions carried out by his noble countenance are not termed as elevation of the sunnah,

rather it is itself the sunnah. Notwithstanding this, after the rulings of sunnah had been established, which of them suffered a decline and fall, and consequently was corrected and elevated by the Prophet ﷺ?

Nevertheless, do as you please, these qualities inevitably link up to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. It is the marvellous nature of ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه speech, that despite ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī's attempts to alter it, it inevitably returns to its true meaning and the blame falls on none other than himself. Surprisingly, it did not even occur to him, that who will use such ambiguous terms whilst praising someone? After the truth has been articulated it requires an art to camouflage it!

Some commentators are of the opinion that it refers to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, which does not harm us in the least. The reason why they attribute these qualities to him is that they claim to have attained a copy of *Nahj al- Balāghah* belonging to the author himself (i.e. ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī) and it had ʿUmar written below the word "Fulān". Along with it, it was inscribed that the linguist, scholar and poet Fakhār ibn Maʿbad too had said this. In addition, he had asked Abu Jaʿfar Yaḥyā ibn Zayd ʿAlawī who is intended and he replied: "'Umar رضي الله عنه!" I thereafter asked: "Amīr al-Mu'minīn praised him to this extent?" And he replied in the affirmative.

For this reason and because the words of some other sermons wherein ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was praised contain similar wording to this, some commentators indicate that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is referred to here. However, it appears more that praise of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه was intended. However, when the Shīʿah saw that this praise is after all for one of the three Ṣaḥābah, they said: "Let us say it is praise of ʿUmar. After all, he is the son-in-law of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, and we should have more regard for him when compared to Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq."

The merits of ʿUmar in the words of ʿAlī

Al-Sammān narrates from Ẓafar ibn Ḥakīm in Kitāb al-Muwāfaqah that when ʿUmar رضي الله عنه passed away, he said: "Let me go to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and hear what he has to say. When I reached his gathering, many people were waiting for him. After a while, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه arrived. First, he dropped his blessed head, then he raised it and said:

لله در باكية عمر، وا عمراه! قوم الأود وأيد العمد، مات نقي الثوب، قليل العيب، وا عمراه! ذهب بالسنة واتقى الفتنة، أصاب والله ابن الخطاب خيرها

ونجى من شرها، ولقد نظر له صاحبه فصار على الطريقة ما استقامت، ثم مال فقال: ورحل المركب فتشعبهم الطريق، لا يهتدي الضال ولا يستيقن المهتدي.

The meaning of this text is also very similar to the first narration. Hence, some commentators, who have already been mentioned, consider the previous narration to refer to ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ. However, when one studies the attributes mentioned herein, he will conclude that it can only fit Abū Bakr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ, as has been discussed earlier. Nevertheless, the corresponding words of these two narrations does not necessitate that both be in praise of one person. If it is deduced that they refer to different people then too, it will not be farfetched. In any case, the rule of ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ was a completion of the rule Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ established the foundations of the khilāfah and then the one who attained the victories over Syria and Iraq (ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ) was appointed his first successor. Furthermore, he was the one who correctly rooted all the necessities of rulership. Hence, it is not hidden from the experts of history that he was the founder of the laws of governance, while ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ was the one who implemented them. In other words, Abu Bakr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ paved a path which ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ treaded. Due to the fact that ʿUmar رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ completed the efforts of Abū Bakr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ, it would make sense for him to also be described with the very same attributes contained in the above-mentioned first narration.

Chapter five

The belief of taqiyyah

Nevertheless, if the Shīʿah assert that they bear enmity for the first three Khulafā' because of what the Imāms have said about them, we have shattered the premise of this excuse as well. Yet we know that the Shīʿah will not abandon the prejudice which spurs them on hating the Ṣaḥābah in a misconstrued sense of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, it will not be surprising for them to proclaim:

> What weight does the words of the Imāms carry? After all, they spent their entire lives in *taqiyyah* (dissimulation), referring to truth as falsehood and falsehood as the truth. When Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, despite being the lion of Allah and called by the title Walī Allāh, feared the first three Khulafā' to such an extent that let alone during their lifetime even during his own khilāfah he could not announce the truth. If this was his state then what need be said of others? We will never accept these narrations; either disprove the belief of taqiyyah or present some other narration wherein they did not practice taqiyyah.

As a result, this unworthy one is forced to expose the reality of taqiyyah as well. This is the ultimate result of prejudice, look to what extent such bias has led them. One is left utterly astonished at that religion which would dare to conjure up concepts such as badā' and taqiyyah.

When the Ahl al-Sunnah present a proof from the Qur'ān then the excuse of badā' was presented and when the words of the Imāms quoted then they are accused of taqiyyah. In essence, whoever invented this religion of Shīʿism was extremely cunning or perhaps a complete dunce, who could not differentiate between a coin and a seed. How sad indeed that such people have been ensnared by these concepts. They could not understand that these whimsical notions have no relation to the dīn of Allah and are but murmurings of those intellectually deprived. If only they did, then ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sabā and his disciples would not have succeeded and the principles of Shīʿism would not have been recorded. Nonetheless, we will reply to this trick of the Shīʿah as well, perhaps Allah might guide someone through it.

Taqiyyah in light of Shīʿah narration

Firstly, the excuse of taqiyyah cannot be presented for the narrations quoted previously, especially the first two as Imām Sajjād Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ praised these Ṣaḥābah while imploring and supplicating to Allah. What reason is there to observe taqiyyah with Allah? If one was addressing a human, then there would be a possibility of the addressee being biased towards the Ṣaḥābah and the need to appease him with such sentiments would be understood. However, if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is accused of such bias then this proves the point of the Ahl al-Sunnah as this proves that Allah himself favours the Ṣaḥābah and the Shīʿah should ponder over their own state. Furthermore, it will prove the Ṣaḥābah to have been on the dīn of truth as Allah is with them and the Qur'ān is filled with verses such as:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Allah is with the pious.

In addition, there is no possibility of Allah also fearing the first three Khulafā', Allah forbid. If the Shīʿah believe such things then it will come as no surprise to us, as they believe the taqiyyah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be no less, since he was the lion of Allah after all.

Control of death, knowledge of the unseen, untold bravery; why the need for taqiyyah then?

Then too, death was in his control. al-Kulaynī has proven that death is in the control of the Imāms. In fact, it is not only al-Kulaynī but all the scholars of the Imāmiyyah are unanimous that the Imāms have knowledge of the past, present and future, to the extent that they knew the precise moment and at whose hand they would be martyred. Yet they still chose to endure such 'disgrace' and 'difficulty' with the knowledge that all their enemies would be unable to harm them or even steal a cent from them. Aside from this infinite knowledge, they were also blessed with such valour that they could fight an entire army and such miraculous feats that they could lift the entire fortress door of Khaybar; what then is the reality of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا before them?

Why then should they fear Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا? Is there any difference then in accusing them of taqiyyah and accusing Allah of taqiyyah? Moreover, Abū Bakr

and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were not even present at that time, having passed away many years prior to this, and it is obvious that even a jackal is not afraid of the deceased; so how then is it possible for the lion of Allah to be afraid? To what extent will we continue arguing this preposterous notion, my intention was to point out that adopting taqiyyah while supplicating, which is a time when one converses with his Rabb, is the same as the munāfiqīn performing ṣalāh or even worse. The munāfiqīn intended to fool people with their actions and according to the Shīʿah paradigm, Imām al-Sajjād رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ intended to fool Allah (Allah forbid). We know this for sure and the Shīʿah do as well, regardless of how foolish they may be; the ibādah of Imām al-Sajjād رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was free from any possibility of *Riyā* (insincerity), thus there is no question of him trying to please any khalīfah or member of the Ahl al-Sunnah in his ʿibādah. The only excuse left (for the Shīʿah) is to say that he supplicated in this manner on account of the 'favouritism' Allah showed to the Khulafā', so that Allah would not become angry on account of his disregard for them. We seek Allah's protection from such blasphemy; assuming that he practiced taqiyyah in such matters destroys the foundations of dīn from whichever angle you look at it. If one were to assume that taqiyyah was practiced here as well, it would result in one harbouring misgivings towards Allah, (Allah is far greater and pure from such matters) or towards the Imāms (we beseech Allah's protection from such beliefs). Nevertheless, these enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt will ascribe anything to the Imāms under the pretence of taqiyyah.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ recited a eulogy for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after his demise, when there was no fear for his life

Imām al-Sajjād رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ aside, after all he was 'oppressed' by his enemies and did not have the same valour as Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, neither did he possess the miraculous powers which he had; so, if someone were to attribute taqiyyah to him perhaps the foolish may believe it. However, the great calamity is that the practice of taqiyyah is ascribed to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well, despite his courage, valour, knowledge, and miraculous powers from the era of the first three Khulafā' and throughout his own. It is assumed that he took false oaths upon ten such qualities that if the sky were to fall on account of it or the earth split open, it would not be surprising. Let alone these qualities being the exact qualities possessed by the Ambiyā' and let alone that it was mentioned for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who according to the Shīʿah is worse than Shayṭān himself (such that they regard cursing him not only as meritorious

but absolving oneself from him as obligatory). If they regard it as greater than this, then too it would be no surprise as Allah says:

> *Whoever comes [on the Day of Judgement] with a good deed will have ten times the like thereof [to his credit].*

Thus, they may regard this obligatory act of theirs to be the greatest deed in the world.

Furthermore, the cursing of the first two Khulafā' has become so commonplace that it is recorded in their books that to curse the first two Khulafā' in the morning is equal to seventy good deeds. Adding to the insult is that they regard cursing Shayṭān, Namrūd, Shaddād, Firʿawn, Abū Jahl, Umayyah ibn Khalf, and Abū Lahab, as well as the other enemies of the Prophet ﷺ, as having no virtue at all. Nevertheless, to now praise those who are even worse than Namrūd, Firʿawn, Abū Jahl, etc., and take an oath upon them possessing ten such meritorious qualities, then too by ʿAlī رضي الله عنه whose qualities we have mentioned above, can only make sense if the meaning of kāfir is: "One who is completely obedient to Allah and submissive to him". If this is the meaning of kufr then how are they cursed or rejected? The Shīʿah can curse all they like but they will have to accept this reality.

> I am referring to you and very pleased am I, may Allah be pleased with you as well; you have said the correct thing

Sometimes a bitter answer is superior than pearls and sugar

Allah سبحانه وتعالى is indeed pure, look to what extent they have destroyed the 'infallibility' and even saintliness of the Imāms. We are aware that the Khawārij might be two steps ahead of the Shīʿah but by only that much that the Shīʿah selectively ascribe faults whereas the Khawārij like a man in a frenzy slaps out at all.

The narrations of the Shīʿah themselves refutes any possibility of taqiyyah

Ultimately the excuse that the Imāms praised the first three Khulafā', the Muhājirīn, and Anṣār under the pretence of taqiyyah, aside from being illogical, is utterly refuted by the fables reported by the Shīʿah in their most relied upon ḥadīth compilations. It is impossible to quote all of these narrations in this treatise but as an example we will quote a few, which will indicate the manner that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه

always announced the truth and himself remained distant from falsehood. Once this is established and the condition of the leader of the Imāms becomes known then the condition of the other Imāms will also become known.

Amīr al-Mu'minīn orders one to be truthful in all circumstances

The following statement of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ has been reported in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which is considered to be an authentic book by the Shīʿah, and is a clear proof for the refutation of taqiyyah:

علامة الايمان ايثارك الصدق حيث يضرك على الكذب حيث ينفعك

> The sign of īmān is giving preference to speaking the truth, when it could harm you, over falsehood which could benefit you.

This narration implies that whoever performs taqiyyah is void of īmān because the sign of īmān is that one still speaks the truth even if harm may befall his person or wealth.

The bravery of the Imām and his desire for Jannah

The second narration is also from *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

> قال امير المؤمنين انى و الله لو لقيتهم واحدا و هم طلاع الارض كلها ما با ليت و لا استوحشت و انى من ضلالتهم التى هم فيها و الهدى الذى انا عليه لعلى بصيرة من نفسى و يقين من ربى و انى الى لقاء الله و لحسن ثوابه لمنتظر راج
>
> ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ said: "If I had to confront them on my own and their numbers filled the entire earth, I still would not care nor would I fear. I have clear vision of the deviance they are upon and the guidance I am on and have complete conviction upon it from my Rabb. I hope to meet Allah and His gracious reward.

Ponder for a moment, a person who does not fear taking on the entire world, not worried by it in the least, and instead desires Jannah and the reward of Allah, what does their practice of taqiyyah mean? If such people have also become afraid (and resorted to taqiyyah) then Qiyāmah has indeed arrived. Furthermore, taqiyyah cannot be done except under fear and then too, fear for one's life, which the

Imāms do not experience as control of their life is in their hands. Al-Kulaynī has established this and all Shīʿah are in agreement upon it. So, who should he fear and why should he be afraid? In addition, the Imāms have knowledge of the past, present and future, they know how and when they are going to die and that they will not die before that.

The Ambiyā' are instructed to be patient, tolerant and always speak the truth

If there is indeed fear for one's wealth and honour then it is the duty of the Ambiyā' and the Imāms to bear this difficulty, to be patient and tolerant and not be bothered by the snubs or strength of the enemy. This is the reason why Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did not hide from Namrūd and accepted instead to be thrown into the fire. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did not fear Firʿawn and was eventually forced to leave Egypt. Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ endured difficulty for nine hundred years, which the Shīʿah must have also heard of. The story of how Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ were murdered is known to all and sundry. We ask the Shīʿah to be just and tell us; were they not killed only because they announced the truth? Honour aside, here they sacrificed their lives. Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (according to Shīʿah belief) even if you say was not better than the Ambiyā', you most certainly regard him to be equal to them, why then did he shy away from their practice?

If taqiyyah was incumbent, then the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be a sin

Even the son of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, the leader of the martyrs, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, sacrificed his life in the path of Allah; if taqiyyah was the sunnah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the compulsory decree of Allah then in which circumstance would it be more incumbent to practice taqiyyah then when you and your family are surrounded by thirty thousand blood thirsty soldiers? No water to drink, no place to take shelter and all they seek is for you to accept the pledge of allegiance to Yazīd. Their lives were lost and their wealth taken, the horrors of that day is known to all, but sadly they failed to practice upon the *farḍ* (compulsory) decree upon the Ahl al-Bayt, earning for themselves the mark of sin and drawing upon himself the blood of all those who lost their lives with him. If this is taqiyyah then we are certain that absolving oneself from it is better than having to believe that Ḥusayn

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ destroyed his world and ākhirah, Allah forbid. I swear by Allah, uttering such words (even if hypothetical) sends a shiver down my spine but Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is the Knower of the Unseen, He knows that whatever I said was not because of taqiyyah but only to refute the deviant sect called the Shīʿah and that this unworthy one is a servant of the Ahl al-Bayt and regards them as the leaders of the saints, the most truthful and sincere, the best of those who do good, the pinnacles of piety and my beloveds, nothing like the empty and false claims of the Shīʿah.

The Imām strikes awe into ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with his miraculous feat

The third narration is of al-Rāwandī, who is a Shīʿah religious leader and commentator on *Nahj al-Balāghah*, he reports from Salmān al-Fārsī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in *Jarā'ih al-Jawā'ih*:

ان على بلغه عن عمر انه ذكر شيعته فاستقبله فى بعض طرقات البساتين المدينة فى يد على قوس فقال يا عمر بلغنى عنك ذكرك لشيعتى فقال اربع على صلعتك فقال على انك لههنا ثم رمى بالقوس على الارض فاذا هى ثعبان كالبعيرفاغرا فاه و قد اقبل نحو عمر لتبلعه فقال عمر الله الله يا ابا الحسن لاعدت بعدها فى شىء و جعل يتفرع اليه فضرب يده الى الثعبان فعادت القوس كما كانت فمضى عمر الى بيته...الخ

This narration is extremely lengthy and to what extent should I report it, when the intended purpose is achieved by this portion. I will now explain the meaning of it.

> Salmān al-Fārsī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrates that news reached ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was speaking ill of his Shīʿah. It just so happened that they crossed paths in one of the pathways of the gardens of Madinah. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said: "'Umar it has reached me that you speak ill of my Shīʿah?"
>
> ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ replied: "Take mercy upon yourself and stop."
>
> ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ answered: "This is the level you have reached?"
>
> He then threw his bow to the ground and it turned into a huge serpent, the size of a camel with its mouth open. It proceeded forward, intending to strike ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.
>
> ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ cried out: "O Abū al-Ḥasan! For Allah's sake (Stop!), for Allah's sake (Stop!), in future I will never say such things."

> He then began trembling. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ stretched his hand towards the serpent and it once again turned into a bow. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then returned to his home.

This was the translation of the above and after reading it, the entire backbone of taqiyyah is broken. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was an awe-inspiring personality from amongst the Khulafā' and the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah often mention this with great pride yet he is subdued with one simple magic trick.

This makes it clear that the silence of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ upon the actions of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, even when witnessing Fadak being 'stolen', wedding his daughter to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, pledging his allegiance to them, performing ṣalāh behind them, etc. were all because he regarded them to be worthy of this honour and not because of taqiyyah. Since he was a person so brave, so strong, and capable of such miraculous feats; no one would dare to cross paths with him. Furthermore, if any person was blessed with such strength and such extraordinary powers, he would never allow his daughter to be forcefully taken from him. In India, not even the plumber or clothes washer will allow his daughter to be taken from him in such a manner as ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ allowed his daughter to be taken from him by ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In addition, when one looks at the sons of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; one was such that he took on an entire army of thirty thousand men in his old age whereas in the prime of his youth, his sister was snatched from him and he did nothing. On the other hand, in the narrations of the incident of Karbala, it has been narrated that when the enemy advanced with the intention of taking the honour of the women of the Ahl al-Bayt, he rose in anger. The Shīʿah are well-acquainted with the incidents of Karbala and there is no need to mention it at this juncture.

Taqiyyah in light of logic and common practice

In essence, the narrations of the Shīʿah themselves uproot the possibility of practicing taqiyyah, and it is not only the Ahl al-Sunnah. There remains no need for any further discussion as this is sufficient for the fair-minded intellectual. However, in order to complete the proof and to elaborate further, it is only appropriate to weigh the practice of taqiyyah in terms of logical reasoning and common practice of society, so that the eyes of the Shīʿah may open. If we were to examine taqiyyah logically then the practice of taqiyyah by the Ambiyā' and Imāms is the equivalent of appointing a teacher to tutor your children and instead of teaching them the subject matter, acts the same as them; playing, hopping, skipping and jumping.

Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى making taqiyyah incumbent upon the Ambiyā' and Imāms is the same as the administration of an Islamic institution instructing the educators to teach the children but not utter a word, to teach them etiquette and manners but not object to their actions, warn them but not rebuke them, in fact do not say anything to them; if they play then you play along with them.

We ask the fair-minded if this is in any way logical and if there is any difference between this and the practice of taqiyyah by the Ambiyā' and Imāms? Furthermore, to practice taqiyyah to such an extent that the entire dīn has been destroyed, the entire ummah led astray; in such a scenario it would befit one to rise up and announce the truth openly, even if your honour and your wealth were to be destroyed, and not play with your words. Despite this, the Shī'ah still firmly believe that the dīn of the Shī'ah is in complete accordance with logic and it is incumbent to follow logic. One can only marvel at the appreciation the Shī'ah have for Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى, when this is their attitude towards Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى who has the right to complain? Firstly, they made Allah the obedient and absolved themselves from Him being "*The wisest of those who pass judgement*", which He mentions in the Qur'ān. Secondly, they ascribe the order of such a practice to Him, which according to their logic necessitates Allah becoming a sinner. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is indeed pure from such slander.

Taqiyyah in light of the Qur'ān

If one were to ask what is the status of taqiyyah in light of the Qur'ān, then there are hundreds of verses which denigrate such taqiyyah (which the Shī'ah practice and ascribe to the Imāms). In fact, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has expressed the exact opposite, mentioning praise for not practicing taqiyyah, such that even when one's life is in danger, it is more praiseworthy not to practice taqiyyah. If the Shī'ah on account of them being unable to remember the Qur'ān were to accuse me of giving false references, then check for yourself whether the following verse is present in Sūrah al-Baqarah:

اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَ لَمَّا يَاْتِكُمْ مَّثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ؕ
مَسَّتْهُمُ الْبَاْسَآءُ وَالضَّرَّآءُ وَ زُلْزِلُوْا حَتّٰى يَقُوْلَ الرَّسُوْلُ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعه
مَتٰى نَصْرُ اللّٰهِ ؕ اَلَآ اِنَّ نَصْرَ اللّٰهِ قَرِيْبٌ

> *Or do you think that you will enter Paradise while such [trial] has not yet come to you as came to those who passed on before you? They were touched by poverty and hardship and were shaken until [even their] messenger and those who believed with him said, "When is the help of Allah?" Unquestionably, the help of Allah is near."*[1]

Also read the verse in Sūrah Āl ʿImrān:

وَكَاَيِّنْ مِّنْ نَّبِيٍّ قٰتَلَ ۙ مَعَه رِبِّيُّوْنَ كَثِيْرٌ ۚ فَمَا وَهَنُوْا لِمَآ اَصَابَهُمْ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَمَا ضَعُفُوْا وَمَا اسْتَكَانُوْا ۗ وَاللّٰهُ يُحِبُّ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ

> *And how many a prophet [fought in battle and] with him fought many religious scholars. But they never lost assurance due to what afflicted them in the cause of Allah, nor did they weaken or submit. And Allah loves the steadfast.*[2]

Taqiyyah deprives one of Jannah

Read these verses fairly without prejudice and gauge for yourself which course of action earns the pleasure of Allah. When this is the instruction of Allah to the ordinary believer it applies more to the Ambiyā' and Imāms. In light of the first verse, the practice of taqiyyah deprives one of even the hope of Jannah, why then will any person resort to taqiyyah? As for the fear of befalling harm from the Ahl al-Sunnah, this has been addressed by Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ as well: *Unquestionably, the help of Allah is near.*

Losing courage out of fear for the disbelievers is prohibited so taqiyyah is extremely far-fetched

In the second verse, taqiyyah aside, losing courage and becoming fearful of the kuffār has been prohibited. Dislike for taqiyyah was hinted to in the portion:

وَمَا اسْتَكَانُوْا

nor did they submit.

because this means that these people did not give in to the kuffār — which in essence is what taqiyyah is — despite the hardships they had to endure. Yet in all

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 214.

2 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 146.

this adversity they did not weaken their resolve nor did they become helpless and remained distant from taqiyyah, never becoming ensnared by it. How great is the planning of Allah but sadly the Shīʿah in their stubbornness are still not satisfied.

What I have said of this verse prohibiting the practice of taqiyyah requires no explanation and is apparent to those who possess knowledge, but for the sake of the Shīʿah some explanation is required. The preceding and following verses make it apparent that one should not practice taqiyyah, if one is in doubt then read it for yourself. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ is relating the incidents of the previous ummah to this ummah, more specifically to the Ṣaḥābah, warning them not to become weak or helpless and thus resort to taqiyyah. We now ask the fair-minded, if a person refuses to accept these warnings (and still resorts to taqiyyah) is he from the unsuccessful ones or of the elite deserving greatest reward; as those who practice taqiyyah claim?

Taqiyyah is reproachable and not praiseworthy

The truth of the matter is that taqiyyah is deserving of reproach and not reward, which is evident from these verses. It is impossible for a person to retain the mantle of nubuwwah and Imāmah while still performing taqiyyah, especially when in the manner that the Shīʿah assume the Prophet صَلَّىٰٱللَّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ and the Imāms used to do with the Ṣaḥābah. More so when the Shīʿah consider the Ṣaḥābah to be even lesser than Shayṭān, as has been alluded to previously, such that the Prophet صَلَّىٰٱللَّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ always agreed with and conceded to what the Ṣaḥābah desired. Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ says in the Qur'ān:

وَلَئِنِ اتَّبَعْتَ اَهْوَآءَهُمْ بَعْدَ مَا جَآءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ ۙ مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللّٰهِ مِنْ وَّلِیٍّ وَّلَا وَاقٍ

And if you should follow their inclinations after what has come to you of knowledge, you would not have against Allah any ally or any protector.[1]

It is not possible that the Prophet صَلَّىٰٱللَّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ would follow their wishes after this verse was revealed and give precedence to their wishes over the wish and desire of Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 37.

The Ambiyā' only fear Allah

In essence Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ has prohibited even the general masses from performing taqiyyah, yet the Shī'ah consider the elite (i.e. the Ambiyā') to have perpetrated it and then too perpetually, whereas the sign of those entrusted with the duty of imparting the message of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ (which according to the Shī'ah includes both the Ambiyā' and Imāms) has been described to be that they fear none but Allah and display no short-coming in imparting the message of Allah. The following verse is mentioned in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

الَّذِيْنَ يُبَلِّغُوْنَ رِسٰلٰتِ اللّٰهِ وَ يَخْشَوْنَه وَلَا يَخْشَوْنَ اَحَدًا اِلَّا اللّٰهَ

[Allah praises] those who convey the messages of Allah and fear Him and do not fear anyone but Allah.[1]

This verse clearly negates any possibility of fear from the Ambiyā' when imparting the message of Allah, yet you will find a Shī'ah saying that taqiyyah means to conceal one's religion whether it be out of fear or for some other reason. They themselves know how illogical this is but still you will find people making such statements. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ is the Knower of the Unseen and was well-aware of the stubbornness of the Shī'ah from before time began, which is why He began this verse saying:

Those who convey the messages of Allah...

Emphasis on propagation

Furthermore, the Ambiyā' were specifically instructed, especially the seal of the Ambiyā', Muḥammad صَلَّىٰاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ, in order to place greater emphasis on the need for propagation and to ensure that no short-coming is perpetrated. It is mentioned Sūrah al-Ḥijr:

فَاصْدَعْ بِمَا تُؤْمَرُ وَاَعْرِضْ عَنِ الْمُشْرِكِيْنَ

Then declare what you are commanded[1] *and turn away from the polytheists.*[2]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 39.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 94.

Thereafter repeated emphasis has been laid upon propagation stressing that there should be no deficiency in imparting the message. If you do not believe me then read it for yourself.

In addition, we have been ordered in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِيْ رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ اُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ لِّمَنْ كَانَ يَرْجُوا اللّٰهَ وَالْيَوْمَ الْاٰخِرَ

There has certainly been for you in the Messenger of Allah an excellent pattern for anyone whose hope is in Allah and the Last Day and [who] remembers Allah often.[1]

This verse has made it incumbent upon the entire ummah that just as the Prophet صَلَّىٰٓاللّٰهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ does not shy away from the truth and propagating dīn, you too should not. Even more so for the Imāms, as they have been sent specifically for the probation of dīn and announcement of the truth, and according to the Shīʿah are no less than the Ambiyā', if not even superior. So, when they were specifically instructed then they should be more mindful of this than others.

The purpose of the Ambiyā' and their deputies is to warn and convey glad-tidings

In addition, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ says:

وَ مَا نُرْسِلُ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ اِلَّا مُبَشِّرِيْنَ وَمُنْذِرِيْنَ

And We send not the messengers except as bringers of good tidings and warners.[2]

"Messengers" in accordance with the terminology of the Qur'ān does not only refer to the Ambiyā' but to all those who impart the message of Allah, whether they be Ambiyā' or not. The verse mentioned in Sūrah Yāsīn:

اِنَّآ اِلَيْكُمْ مُّرْسَلُوْنَ

"Indeed, we are messengers to you."[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 21

2 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 56

3 Sūrah Yā Sīn: 14.

Refers to the deputies of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, who were not Ambiyā' but rather only deputies, which is the actual meaning of imām according to the Shīʿah; deputy of the Nabī. If a person were to object that the messengers of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ are not referred to in this verse as the verse mentions:

اِذْ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلَيْهِمُ اثْنَيْنِ

When We sent to them two.

Which indicates that these messengers were sent by Allah and not Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, then the reply to this would be that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ attributed the sending of these messengers by Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to Himself, saying that We sent them and not that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ sent them. When the deputy of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was acknowledged as the deputy of Allah then why should the deputy of our Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not be recognised as the deputy of Allah as well? When they too have been sent by Allah then their duties will be in the same and in accordance with the verse:

وَ مَا نُرْسِلُ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ اِلَّا مُبَشِّرِيْنَ وَمُنْذِرِيْنَ

And We send not the messengers except as bringers of good tidings and warners.

We now ask, where is taqiyyah in all of this? We will never blacken our faces and envisage that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the pure Imāms could have ever been deficient in acting upon the order of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. They spent their day and night propagating dīn and why should they not? The verse is self-explanatory that Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is not deficient in propagating the message, so why should his deputies conceal the message? If this is the case, then they are not his true deputies but the opposite.

The purpose of risālat is propagation

Secondly, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ mentions the purpose of the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ risālat to be the propagation and transmission of dīn. It is mentioned in Sūrah al-Fatḥ, Sūrah al-Ṣaff and Sūrah al-Tawbah:

هُوَ الَّذِیْٓ اَرْسَلَ رَسُوْلَه بِالْهُدٰی وَ دِیْنِ الْحَقِّ لِیُظْهِرَه عَلَی الدِّیْنِ کُلِّه

It is He who sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion. And sufficient is Allah as Witness.[1]

The dominance or becoming apparent over all religions mentioned in this verse, if attributed to the Prophet ﷺ then the meaning is obvious but if the implication is that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ has taken the responsibility of making dīn apparent by sending His Messenger then whatever success will be attained by His Nabī ﷺ will be the doing of Allah. The example of the Prophet ﷺ in this case will be like that of a tool used by a labourer to complete his task, which makes it clear and in fact clearer than daylight, that when the intention of Allah is to make dīn apparent, who can ever conceal it? This verse is in fact a clear proof for the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah because whichever Shīʿah will embrace the Sunnī faith under the guise of taqiyyah, he will conceal his beliefs of Shīʿism and make apparent the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In this way he has acknowledged that the *madhab* (school) of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the true faith because the *dhamīr* (personal pronoun) of the word "لیظهره" (make it apparent) refers to the dīn of truth, and the faith of the Shīʿah will then be included in "All other religions", and it is obvious that all other religions are false. This verse also indicates that the propagation of dīn required by this verse should occur before the emergence of Imām al-Mahdī. The reason being that for dominance, two things are required: a dominator and the dominated. Similarly, when something becomes apparent over another than it requires that the latter still remain. So, the dominance and becoming apparent over mentioned in this verse, and alluded to by the words "لیظهره", indicate that this dīn will become apparent over other religions and not that the other religions will no longer exist. The Shīʿah should now inform us whether other religions will remain in the time of Imām al-Mahdī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or not? In addition, the word "لیظهره" (to make it apparent) is affixed to "ارسل" (sent his Messenger) which would necessitate that it become apparent at the same time that the Messenger ﷺ was sent. This cannot refer to any other dīn except that of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shīʿah should inform me whether I am true or false? After this there remains no necessity to even discuss whether taqiyyah has any relevance in dīn or not.

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 28.

Propagation of dīn is compulsory upon the Ambiyā' and Imāms

In order to clarify my point even further, whenever any Nabī is sent then at first, he alone is a believer; so now if he were to remain silent and conceal dīn then the duty of imparting the message will remain unfulfilled, and it is an accepted fact that propagation of the message is incumbent upon the Ambiyā' and ʿUlamā'. The incumbency of propagating the message upon our Nabī ﷺ becomes apparent from the following verse:

يٰۤاَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّغْ مَاۤ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ ؕ وَ اِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهٗ ؕ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.[1]

Similarly, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says addressing the ummah:

وَلْتَكُنْ مِّنْكُمْ اُمَّةٌ يَّدْعُوْنَ اِلَى الْخَيْرِ وَيَاْمُرُوْنَ بِالْمَعْرُوْفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

And let there be [arising] from you a nation inviting to [all that is] good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful.[2]

It is obvious that those who know what is good and what is evil are the ʿUlamā' and the more knowledge one possesses the more incumbent it is upon him to propagate dīn. Who then is it most incumbent upon to propagate dīn if not the Imāms? If the Ambiyā' remained silent and never uttered a word about dīn then they would be sinners. However, if they propagated dīn then it is obvious that the message would not appeal to the inner self, which would result in some accepting and others rejecting. When something does not appeal to the inner self than you will only find one in every hundred thousand capable of being the same as Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, accepting the truth immediately, while the majority will provide hundreds of excuses for rejecting and at times even become your enemy. If in such a time a Nabī were to fear the reaction of people, then what is the difference between a Nabī and the lovers of worldly pursuit? If he were to shy away from his mission because

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67.

2 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 104.

of the objections of people, then he will be dubbed a liar and even his supporters will distance themselves from him.

However, if he remains firm and endures the attacks of people on his name, person and wealth then ease will soon follow. It is the promise of Allah that after difficulty and strife, ease always follows:

اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَ لَمَّا يَاْتِكُمْ مَّثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ؕ مَسَّتْهُمُ الْبَاْسَآءُ وَالضَّرَّآءُ وَ زُلْزِلُوْا حَتّٰى يَقُوْلَ الرَّسُوْلُ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعه مَتٰى نَصْرُ اللّٰهِ ؕ اَلَآ اِنَّ نَصْرَ اللّٰهِ قَرِيْبٌ

Or do you think that you will enter Paradise while such [trial] has not yet come to you as came to those who passed on before you? They were touched by poverty and hardship and were shaken until [even their] messenger and those who believed with him said, "When is the help of Allah?" Unquestionably, the help of Allah is near.[1]

When ease has come and the help of Allah descended then for what disease is taqiyyah a cure for? In essence there is no circumstance in which taqiyyah can be deemed permissible for the Ambiyā' and since the Imāms are the deputies of the Prophet ﷺ, and a deputy has the same task with which he has been deputised, the propagation of dīn is incumbent upon them also. In fact, it is not specifically incumbent upon them only but incumbent upon the entire ummah as well, as has just been mentioned above. However, they have been specifically appointed for this task and then too the Imāms are "infallible"; they cannot sin in any way, so it is impossible for them to practice taqiyyah just as it is impossible for the Ambiyā'.

The Makkan period eliminates any possibility of taqiyyah

It is through the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى that after studying the lives of the Prophet ﷺ and the other Ambiyā', we learn that none of them ever shied away from speaking the truth and instead for the sake of the truth, were prepared to sacrifice their honour, standing, wealth, and lives. The life of the Prophet ﷺ is well-known, every Muslim must have heard of the courageous sacrifices he made for Islam. The persecution against the Prophet ﷺ had reached such a level that he

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 214.

was boycotted and forced to live outside Makkah whilst the kuffār made a pact with each other not to have any financial or social relations with him and the Muslims. This also failed to silence the Prophet ﷺ and finally they resolved to kill him, and he left secretly and migrated to Madīnah. If taqiyyah was permissible, leave alone compulsory, then why did he endure such difficulty? Why then did he leave the sacred city of Makkah, wherein the blessed Kaʿbah lies? Why were Abū Jahal and Abū Lahab his enemies? It is obvious that nothing besides his continuous zeal to announce the truth was what turned them against him. The Prophet ﷺ had not snatched authority from their hands nor did he usurp their wealth. The same argument can be made in favour of Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام, why was he thrown into the fire, why was he forced to leave his home and migrate? Their only crime was adherence to the truth and continually calling towards it. It is clear as daylight; the Ambiyā' never practised taqiyyah nor was it permissible for them to do so.

Likewise, their deputies too never practiced taqiyyah nor could they ever do so. The horrific event of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and the terrible suffering he had to endure is well-known to all. The chief cause of this entire incident was his unflinching honesty and announcement of the truth. If it were any other way, then he would have sworn himself to Yazīd whereby not only would his life have been spared but he would have been handsomely rewarded as well. The battle that ensued between Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه is known by all. Aside from this, the conditions of each of the Imāms must have been heard, how they were all assassinated or imprisoned by various emperors. If they had been practicing taqiyyah then why did they undergo all this suffering and torture?

In favour of an ordinary Muslim; it might be permissible if one has a legitimate excuse, but it will never be compulsory. For example, a young boy, woman, the blind, paralysed, a prisoner or any other person faced with no other alternative but to give in to the kuffār, may do so but on condition that there is fear of him losing a limb or loved one (perhaps the life of his son, mother, wife, etc. is being threatened) but if there is only fear of a little pain which he is able to endure then it will not be permissible for him to concede to their demands.

The reward and encouragement of patience

All the same, true reward lies in not practicing taqiyyah because the numerous praises and virtues the Qur'ān mentions for those who adopt patience are for those

who do so in adversity. If this praise were not for those patient in adversity, then what adversity is there in taqiyyah that would warrant one to be patient. Taqiyyah does not lead to adversity, it brings comfort and fortune. This is the reason why the Qur'ān stresses most on adopting patience and no other quality has been emphasised in the same manner. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

وَالْعَصْرِ اِنَّ الْاِنْسَانَ لَفِیْ خُسْرٍ اِلَّا الَّذِیْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ وَ تَوَاصَوْا بِالْحَقِّ ۙ وَ تَوَاصَوْا بِالصَّبْرِ

By time! man is in a state of loss indeed, except those who believed and did righteous deeds, and advised each other for truth, and advised each other for patience.[1]

Where can truthfulness be found in the Shīʿah faith? Instead, they encourage the concealment of the truth. Abū Bakr رَضِیَ اللّٰہُ عَنْہُ concealed one matter regarding Fadak (according to the Shīʿah paradigm) and he is cursed for eternity, so how cursed are those who conceal the entire truth, the entire dīn of Islam, how many thousand curses are upon them?

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الصّٰبِرِیْنَ

Verily Allah is with those who are patient.[2]

وَاللّٰهُ یُحِبُّ الصّٰبِرِیْنَ

Allah loves those who are patient.[3]

The Noble Qur'ān is filled with verses such as these; encouraging patience. If there were such a thing as taqiyyah then there would be no such thing as patience. In fact, the practice of taqiyyah has not been ordered anywhere in the Qur'ān. If it is allowed then it is only allowed for the common Muslims and then too for the weak amongst them, when their life is in danger, and it is not a blanket permissibility. In the same breath it should be stated that in such circumstances it is only permissible and not compulsory; in fact, not practicing it would be more meritorious.

1 Sūrah al-ʿAṣr.

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 46.

3 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 146.

Migration is compulsory when practicing the truth is not possible

If one is truly faced with conditions under which taqiyyah is permissible, then he should contemplate upon migrating and that too as soon as he is able to do so. He should migrate to such a place wherein nothing will prevent him from announcing the truth. The Qur'ān also has numerous verses emphasising the importance of migration:

اِنَّ اَرْضِیْ وَاسِعَةٌ فَاِیَّایَ فَاعْبُدُوْنِ

O My servants who have believed, indeed My earth is spacious, so worship only Me.[1]

In another verse, Allah says:

اِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ تَوَفّٰهُمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ ظَالِمِیْٓ اَنْفُسِهِمْ قَالُوْا فِیْمَ كُنْتُمْ ؕ قَالُوْا كُنَّا مُسْتَضْعَفِیْنَ فِی الْاَرْضِ ؕ قَالُوْٓا اَلَمْ تَكُنْ اَرْضُ اللّٰهِ وَاسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوْا فِیْهَا ؕ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ مَاْوٰىهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ؕ وَسَآءَتْ مَصِیْرًا

Indeed, those whom the angels take [in death] while wronging themselves - [the angels] will say, "In what [condition] were you?" They will say, "We were oppressed in the land." They [the angels] will say, "Was not the earth of Allah spacious [enough] for you to emigrate therein?" For those, their refuge is Hell - and evil it is as a destination.[2]

Aside from the above, there are even more verses containing the instruction to perform hijrah and the underlying reason for it, is that one is unable to propagate the laws of sharīʿah. In summary, taqiyyah under these conditions will be permissible, not compulsory, and it is incumbent upon them to then migrate to a land wherein they will be able to propagate the truth.

Propagating the truth is best, even when in danger

It is mentioned in the Qur'ān:

1 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 56.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 97.

لَا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ اَوْلِيَآءَ مِنْ دُوْنِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ ۚ وَمَنْ يَّفْعَلْ ذٰلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللّٰهِ فِيْ شَيْءٍ اِلَّآ اَنْ تَتَّقُوْا مِنْهُمْ تُقٰيةً وَ يُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللّٰهُ نَفْسَه ؕ وَ اِلَى اللّٰهِ الْمَصِيْرُ

Let not believers take disbelievers as allies [i.e., supporters or protectors] rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing [i.e., no association] with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the [final] destination.[1]

This verse only permits one to save himself, in no way does it permit one to conform entirely to the kuffār and keep them as one's dear friends. One is also able to save himself by migrating from that place.

Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى has stressed on the point that one should fear Him as it is to Him that you are to return. What do you fear the kuffār for, you should conform to them entirely only if your final return were to them. It is a different matter if a person is captured by them, imprisoned or suffers from some disability or the other, or is a woman or child and the kuffār force him to conform to their beliefs. This too only if he is threatened with such a torture which he will be unable to bear; he may be killed or a limb severed, in this case he has the choice to concede to their demands. However, reward will still be in him adhering to his beliefs and not conceding to the demands of the kuffār. The clause in the verse:

اِلَّا مَنْ اُكْرِهَ وَ قَلْبُه مُطْمَئِنٌّۢ بِالْاِيْمَانِ

Except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith.[2]

Informs us that one is only permitted to outwardly conform to their demands under duress. However, those verses which enumerate the virtues of those who are slain in the path of Allah inform us that true reward lies in proclaiming the truth, even if one's life may be threatened.

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 28.

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl:106.

Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ never concealed any aspect of dīn

If any person were to then mention the 'untruths' told by Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ in support of his claim for the permissibility of taqiyyah then this will be a grave injustice. It might have appeared to be untrue but in reality, it was not, which will become apparent from his story.

When Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ began calling towards tawḥīd and preventing his people from idol worship then amongst the first people to oppose him was his own father, who even threatened him. Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was contemplating over how he could somehow destroy their idols when it just so happened that their day of ʿĪd arrived and they came to invite Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ also to join in the festivities. He then looked towards the heavens and said: "I am going to be ill." The kuffār thought that just as they believed in the stars so too did Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ believe in them and that if he participated in the festivities, he would fall ill. It should be noted that all he said was that, I am going to be ill or the signs of illness are setting in and he never said: "I have studied the stars and have discovered that I am going to be ill.", which would have been a lie. It was the kuffār who assumed that he determined this by studying the stars.

Once they had left, he proceeded to destroy all of their idols, leaving only the biggest of them untouched. When the kuffār saw what had happened to their idols, they had him brought forward, since he was the only one they knew who had denounced idol worship before. When asked if he had done it, he mockingly replied: "This big idol was the one who did it." This is the second lie he is accused of. No sane person will consider this to be a lie but, in our vernacular, it will be considered to be a truth. How are these two 'lies' equal to concealing the truth. In fact, the greatest proof that these statements are the opposite and rather proclaiming the truth is that he was thrown into the fire on account of them and more so on account of him saying: "The big one did it." This is definitely no lie but rather it exposes the truth more than concealing it. Everybody knows that this was not said with the intention of lying but was the plan of Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to make them see the error of their ways, because then why did they become angry at him? Concealing the truth is indeed far-fetched. Furthermore, the answers that he gave to the king thereafter; there are very few who can do so in such a circumstance.

His claim of being ill that was first made, he did not make out of fear for his life nor

was it out of fear for his wealth or honour but to fulfil a deep desire in his heart. It was only said so that they would leave and he could destroy their idols, which in itself would endanger his life. It can also be that he wished to save himself from participating in the customs, practices and worship of the kuffār. So, in reality these statements were made in the spirit of sacrifice and only that person will claim that spirit of sacrifice and taqiyyah are one and the same, who cannot distinguish between a tail and a nose.

Concealing one's marital status does not equal to the concealment of dīn

As for the third 'untruth', Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was migrating with his wife, Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, when they passed a city which was ruled by a tyrannical and immoral king. A solider of the army had informed the king of the immense beauty of Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and as a result he summoned them to his court. Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ understood that he must have heard about Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and in his lust, if he were to hear that I am her husband, he will surely kill me. As a result, he instructed Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا that if the king asks about their relationship then she should inform him that she is his sister since they are brother and sister in dīn and Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا were indeed cousins, she being the daughter of his maternal uncle. Thus, in reality this was no lie and even if we were to hypothetically accept that it was then too this was not concealing dīn in anyway. If anything was concealed, then it was their relationship of marriage and then too only to protect that life meant for the propagation of truth from being taken for such a trivial matter. In summary, the purpose of saving his own life was so that he could propagate the truth tomorrow and not sacrifice his life for something so trivial. In conclusion, to substantiate the legitimacy of taqiyyah from the life of Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is a sign of poor understanding and perception.

In the precise manner, the hijrah of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, taking refuge in the Cave of Thawr, etc. were all for the purpose of proclaiming the truth since there was nothing to prevent the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from conceding to the demands of the kuffār and the need for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to practice taqiyyah at that juncture was definitely greater. Also, under the categories of such taqiyyah will be warding off a blow from an enemy sword with your shield and if defending yourself is defined as taqiyyah then most definitely this will be on account of announcing

the truth (and not concealing it), since one will only be required to defend himself when another intends to harm you.

The difference between defending yourself and taqiyyah

All must have understood by now the difference between defending yourself and taqiyyah but I wish to elaborate on this further. According to the Shīʿah, taqiyyah is employed to remove the intention to cause you harm from the heart of the enemy which is achieved by distancing yourself from (i.e. concealing) your true beliefs and promoting the beliefs of the enemy. Thus, when one outwardly adopts the beliefs of the enemy (practices taqiyyah) the enemy no longer remains the enemy and in fact becomes a friend.

However, in the case of defending yourself, the enmity only increases and the fear of harm becomes even greater because it is the rule of man that as long as one has his enemy under his control and able to harm him whenever he desires, then he does not fear him. He remains unconcerned about him as he can harm or disgrace him whenever he pleases. However, when a person defends himself then the fear of retaliation arises, which increases the enmity. In such an event the enemy will pull out all the stops in defending itself and this is when those closest to Allah have to endure the greatest difficulty. Keep this difference in mind, it will prove beneficial later.

According to the Shīʿah, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ failed to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

When this has been established, then those who have any sense of impartiality should compare the circumstances which the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ faced in Makkah and on his journey of hijrah with the situation ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ faced after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Assuming that the Ṣaḥābah reneged, then in tracing the footsteps of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ ought to have dealt with them in the same manner that the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ dealt with Abū Jahal, Umayyah bin Khalaf and the rest of the kuffār. If he were to have done so then sooner or later, he would have faced the tribulations which the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ experienced, thereby compelling him to undertake the only alternative of hijrah, which was the course the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ ultimately took.

However, it is rather strange that he never once expressed to the Ṣaḥābah that he alone was upon truth and they were upon falsehood. Assuming that he had expressed this, there could have been one of two outcomes. The Ṣaḥābah would have attested to the veracity of his claim, in which case there would remain no need for taqiyyah and there would be no objection against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, this would have been exactly what ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have desired, or they would have rejected his claim. If this were a possibility, then why is it that they did not harm such an enemy or persecute him thereafter?

If it is said that despite opposing them, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ remained unharmed on account of his valour and courage or due to the divine aid of Allah then this is absurd because it implies that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is lesser than ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Why then was the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not spared from the persecution of his enemies?

It is thus established that the claim of taqiyyah against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is indeed false. If he were to have resorted to taqiyyah, then he should have resorted to it in Makkah Mukarramah. If not there, then it was more appropriate to exercise taqiyyah with Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If he had resorted to taqiyyah with Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then the worst that could have happened was that the murderers of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have been executed. After all, they held no position of importance to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which justifies the great dissension the ummah was subjected to on account of not handing them over.

In contrast to this, whilst ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ 'spared' the killers of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sacrificed his own life and that of his innocent family members. His mission apparently seemed to be futile and more of a suicide operation, considering his insignificant, ill-equipped band of followers against a formidable army of thirty-thousand men.

If ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had handed over the murderers of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, his khilāfah and authority would have been established indisputably, a 'rebel' and 'mischief-monger' would have been subdued and dīn would have flourished. In addition to this, handing over the killers would have been totally justified as they were villains, not innocent victims like the companions of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

The reality is that it is the Shīʿah who have actually levelled the accusation of concealing the truth against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and it is they who have labelled him as a coward.

سُبْحَانَكَ هٰذَا بُهْتَانٌ عَظِيْمٌ

You are indeed pure; this is but greave slander.

Taqiyyah was obligatory upon ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ during his reign as khalīfah

The absurdity of the Shīʿī doctrine of taqiyyah does not end here. Consequently, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who is one of their acclaimed scholars, maintains that taqiyyah was incumbent upon ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ even whilst he held the highest position of authority as the khalīfah. Will this confounded taqiyyah ever leave ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ in peace?

If we were to ask, why then did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ dismiss Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ if taqiyyah was incumbent on him, especially when ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ considered him a potential threat and even expressed that his plotting was destructive. In addition to this, he was advised by Ibn ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ to postpone the dismissal until his authority was established. However, he did not heed their advice and this led to such repercussions, the details of which is documented in Shīʿī sources as well.

Now reflect on the argument and evidence of Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. He says that ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ position as the khalīfah was fictitious since Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was constantly at loggerheads with him. Similarly, his army and most of his close associates were the offspring of the Ṣaḥābah, who were actually his staunch enemies, and all of his men attested to the merit and legitimacy of the reign of the first and second Khulafā'. If ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ were to have expressed the truth under such overwhelming circumstances, he would have suffered an irretrievable loss and he would lose the loyalty of his entire force. It is for this reason that proclaiming the truth was prohibited and it was incumbent upon him to resort to taqiyyah even whilst holding the position of khalīfah.

For the record it must be stated that Sharīf al-Murtaḍā has differed with the view of the mainstream Shīʿah, who maintain that taqiyyah was only incumbent upon him before assuming the position of khalīfah and it was prohibited thereafter. However, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā thought that his stance was more prudent and effective, but his plot has worked against him.

Assessing the allegation of resorting to taqiyyah during his reign as the khalīfah

Sharīf al-Murtaḍā pre-empted the possibility of some Sunnī analysing the sermons and discourses of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which he delivered during his khilāfah and perhaps stumble upon his glowing tribute to the Ṣaḥābah in general and the first two Khulafā' specifically. Or that a Sunnī may question why ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ failed to promote the Shīʿī creed during his reign, just as Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا "concealed" the original teachings and promoted their "fabricated religion" in their appointed terms. Similarly, his position as the fourth khalīfah was more opportune for him to promote the correct dīn as opposed to the sequence of khilāfah being reversed. Notwithstanding this, why is it that the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah prevailed?

The only logical answer to this would be that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ favoured the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It is because of these damning possibilities that Sharīf al-Murtaḍā took the stance that he took on taqiyyah.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ failed to promote dīn despite having supernatural abilities

If ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ position as the khalīfah was superficial; did it not occur to him that khilāfah or wilāyah refers to nothing more than holding authority to pass decrees in the land under one's governance, being able to collect taxes and revenue and having the force with which to deal with criminals and bandits. With the exception of Syria, in which other domain of Muslim lands did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not enjoy such authority? There can be no two opinions about his consolidated authority over Ḥijāz, Oman, Makkah, Madīnah, Bahrain, Iraq, Azerbaijan, Persia and Khurāsān. Is this not sufficient authority and influence in contrast to the hold of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ over Syria? ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was surely in a position to pass any decree.

Bear in mind that the tiny Arabian Peninsula which Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ assumed authority over after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was afflicted with multiple challenges; whilst Musaylamah and the Banū Yamāmah rebelled on one front, Sajāh claimed nubuwwah and with the support of the entire Banū Tamīm, which was the largest of the Arab tribes. The rejecters of zakāh and the multitudes of renegades were a separate challenge along with the Banū Usfān and other tribes who disputed the political authority of Madīnah. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was left with a small group of loyal Muslims only in Makkah and Madīnah, but they did not surrender in the least

nor did they compromise. They certainly could have appeased all their foes as easily as they could have appeased those who refused to submit zakāh.

Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ defended the truth all by himself

Despite the lack of resources and the comparative 'lack of bravery', Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not alarmed by the overwhelming threat, despite most of his opponents being skilled at warfare and some of them even ruling over little kingdoms as well. Notwithstanding the fact that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ lacked the attributes which ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ possessed (ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is characterised to have unparalleled bravery, the ability to display unique miraculous feats, the one legitimately entitled as the walī and the khalīfah, etc.), Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ still achieved what he achieved, why is it that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was unable to accomplish his mission and proclaim the truth? If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had these attributes of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then there would have been no chance of any non-believer ever surviving in the world. We make this claim and we would take full responsibility for it, if he would achieve anything less than that.

As for saying that the majority of ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ army consisted of the offspring of Ṣaḥābah, this is a statement that would have sounded better if uttered by a Sunnī. What grounds does Sharīf al-Murtaḍā have for making such a statement? Has he not heard the statement of Qādhī Nūr Allāh, who said that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not prevail because he only had the support of five individuals from the Quraysh, whilst the rest of the thirteen tribes stood with Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

In addition to this, the Shīʿah claim that the companions of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were actually the die-hard Kufis. However, if his army only comprised of the offspring of the Ṣaḥābah, then just as they believed in the merit and legitimacy of the first two Khulafā' and approved of their khilāfah, they were also fully acquainted with the teachings of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which was transmitted to them by their parents.

Also, assuming that they would have forsaken ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ if he were to have proclaimed the truth, his cause would not have suffered any setbacks at all. After all, there are such temptations within the 'Dīn of ʿAlī' which would make just about every sceptic succumb. If the supporters of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have heard of the legitimacy of mutʿā (temporary marriage) they would have surely abandoned him. In fact, any person who devoutly subscribed to any religion would have been lured by the temptation of mutʿā; which legalises promiscuity in this world and

secures the ultimate ranks of the hereafter. No matter how staunch anyone may have been upon his religion, the call to mutʿā was sure to make them deflect and unite under the standard of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Furthermore, the concession of not washing one's feet in wuḍū and being relieved of tarāwīḥ ṣalāh add to the temptation. Such a religion and such faith could only be the fortune of very lucky people. If ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would have proclaimed the truth, then the entire Arab and non-Arab populace would have responded.

Allah is pure! Such a flimsy premise and yet they have the audacity to challenge the Ahl al-Sunnah? They should have at least realised that from beginning to end, the loyal supporters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were those who were either brothers, relatives or children of people who were his sworn enemies, consider Khālid bin Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ʿIkramah bin Abī Jahal رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was also the nephew of Abū Jahal and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the son of Abū Quḥāfah. As for ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he was the close relative of Abū Sufyān, and this was the case for the majority of the Ṣaḥābah.

When these ties of kinship did not pose a deterrent for them standing up to the truth, nothing else could possibly have deterred them from supporting the truth or defending it.

Proclaiming the truth and suffering the consequences has always been the hallmark of the chosen servants of Allah

Let us conclude this discussion on taqiyyah by citing two verses of the Noble Qur'ān, which proves that the chosen servants of Allah have always suffered persecution at the hands of the enemies of Allah. Let it be known thereby that Allah loves steadfastness and endurance for the sake of dīn, not complacency and compromise. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ يَكْفُرُوْنَ بِاٰيٰتِ اللّٰهِ وَيَقْتُلُوْنَ النَّبِيّٖنَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ ۙ وَّيَقْتُلُوْنَ الَّذِيْنَ يَاْمُرُوْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ مِنَ النَّاسِ ۙ فَبَشِّرْهُمْ بِعَذَابٍ اَلِيْمٍ

Those who disbelieve in the signs of Allah and kill the prophets without right and kill those who order justice from among the people - give them tidings of a painful punishment.[1]

1 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 21.

Allah warns those who took the lives of the Ambiyā' and the lives of those who proclaimed the truth of a painful torment. This verse establishes that the Ambiyā' of Allah and the righteous ones never resort to taqiyyah.

Ponder over the following verse as well:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَنْ يَّرْتَدَّ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِيْنِه فَسَوْفَ يَاْتِى اللّٰهُ بِقَوْمٍ يُّحِبُّهُمْ وَيُحِبُّوْنَهٗٓ ۙ اَذِلَّةٍ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اَعِزَّةٍ عَلَى الْكٰفِرِيْنَ ۖ يُجَاهِدُوْنَ فِىْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَلَا يَخَافُوْنَ لَوْمَةَ لَآئِمٍ ۗ ذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَآءُ ۗ وَاللّٰهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيْمٌ

O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allah will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him [who are] humble toward the believers, strong against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allah and do not fear the blame of a critic. That is the favor of Allah; He bestows it upon whom He wills. And Allah is all-Encompassing and Knowing.[1]

This verse establishes that the beloved ones, who truly love Allah, are never suppressed by the disbelievers nor do they behave complacently towards them. Instead, they confront them, oppose them and fear no rebuke. Is taqiyyah not the exact opposite of this? If so, then taqiyyah certainly is not the hallmark of the chosen ones of Allah. Rather, it is the trait of the enemies of Allah and His messenger.

Judging taqiyyah by social standards

The discussion thus far exposed the fallacy of taqiyyah in the light of sound reasoning and narration. It would now be appropriate to test its merit by social norms and standards so that its absurdity may be fully exposed.

Society has always acknowledged and lauded resoluteness and steadfastness and people look upon double-standards and hypocrisy with scorn and disdain, especially in matters pertaining to religion. If the Ambiyā' of Allah and those charged with the responsibility of proclaiming the truth were to have expressed the truth once

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 54.

only and thereafter compromised with the disbelievers for fear of losing their lives or dignity, then everyone would accuse them of having some worldly motive. As a result, the object of displaying miracles would be defeated, and those who had any inclination to the truth would be disheartened, those upon guidance would lose faith after concluding that the ultimate objective of these Ambiyā' was but a quest for name and fame.

It is a well-known fact that the effectiveness of any person's admonition and advice depends on his practical conformance to it. If taqiyyah is valid then there is no question of being a practical example of what one is preaching. The doors to guidance would be sealed.

Therefore, the fallacy of taqiyyah is established through logic, narration, and even social standards. Yet you will find those, whose vision is distorted, failing to see the truth no matter how clear it may be. Furthermore, it is reported in a ḥadīth that "Love for something makes one blind and deaf." If they were to distance the love of the Shīʿī faith from their hearts for just a moment and thereafter analyse the discussions for and against taqiyyah, then (Allah willing) even ʿAmmār ʿAlī will be compelled to repent and forget all about converting Nadir ʿAlī to Shīʿism.

Whilst there is no need for further elaboration on taqiyyah let us pose the following question to the Shīʿī scholars thereby completing the argument against them. Let us assume, despite it being impossible, that taqiyyah is valid, then when the majority of Siḥāḥ scholars maintain that taqiyyah was prohibited during the reign of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, how can ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ praise of the Ṣaḥābah still be classified as taqiyyah?

Imām al-Bāqir curses those who refute the title of al-Ṣiddīq

If we were to accept the view of those who maintain that taqiyyah was incumbent upon ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ even during his reign as the khalīfah, then despite this being preposterous and baseless by all standards, we would ask why did Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ praise Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, when the Shīʿah maintain that Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was prohibited by Allah from resorting to taqiyyah? This prohibition of taqiyyah for Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ is recorded by ʿAlī ibn Īsā and by al-Ardabīlī in his book *Kashf al-Ghummah ʿan Maʿrifah al-Imāms*. The text is as follows:

سئل الإمام أبو جعفر عن حلية السيف ، هل يجوز؟ فقال : نعم ، قد حلى أبو بكر الصديق سيفه. فقال الراوي ، القول هكذا؟ فوثب الإمام عن مكانه فقال : نعم الصديق ، نعم الصديق ، نعم الصديق – فمن لم يقل له الصديق فلا صدق الله قوله في الدنيا والآخرة

Imām Abū Jaʿfar (Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ) was asked about the permissibility of decorating the handle of the sword with gold or silver. He replied that it was permissible and as proof cited that the sword of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was embellished with silver. The person who posed the question then asked him if he referred to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as "Al-Ṣiddīq", whereupon he became angry, rose from his place and stated three times that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ certainly is "Al-Ṣiddīq", and whoever disputes this then may Allah never let his word be true in this world or in the hereafter.

Let it be known that the Shīʿah are unanimous about the scholarship and credibility of ʿAlī ibn Īsā and al-Ardabīlī and that their transmissions are beyond any doubt.

Why was taqiyyah ḥarām for Imām al-Bāqir?

If one were to ask why Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was not permitted to resort to taqiyyah then the following narration of al-Kulaynī should clarify the issue:

عن معاذ بن كثير عن ابي عبد الله قال : إن الله عز وجلّ أنزل على نبيه كتابا فقال : يا محمد ؛ هذه وصيتك إلى النجباء ، فقال : ومن النجباء يا جبريل؟ فقال : علي بن أبي طالب وولده. كان على الكتاب خواتيم من ذهب ، فدفعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى علي وأمره أن يفكّ خاتما منه فيعمل بما فيه. ثم دفعه إلى الحسن ففكّ عنه خاتماً فعمل بما فيه ، ثم دفعه إلى الحسين ففكّ خاتما ، فوجد فيه : أخرج بقوم إلى الشهادة فلا شهادة لهم إلا معك واشتر نفسك لله ، ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى علي بن الحسين ففكّ خاتما فوجد فيه: أن أطرق واصمت وألزم منزلك واعبد ربك حتي يأتيك اليقين ، ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى إبنه محمد بن علي بن الحسين عليه السلام ، ففكّ خاتما فوجد فيه : حدّث الناس وأفتهم وانشر علوم أهل بيتك وصدّق آباءك الصالحين ، ولا تخافنّ أحداً إلا الله ، فإنه لا سبيل لأحد عليك. ثم دفعه إلى جعفر الصادق ففكّ خاتما ، فوجد فيه : حدّث الناس وأفتهم وانشر علوم

أهل بيتك وصدّق آباءك الصالحين ، فإنك في حرز وأمان. ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى إبنه موسى عليه السلام وهكذا إلى قيام المهدي – ورواه من طريق آخر عن معاذ بن كثير أيضاً عن أبي عبد الله وفيه : في الخاتم الخامس : وقل الحق في الأمن والخوف ولا تخش إلا الله ؛ إهـ

The summary of this narration is as follows:

> Al-Kulaynī transmits from Muʿādh ibn Kathīr, who reports from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ revealed a document to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and told him that this document contained his *wasiyyah* (bequest) to the "Nujabā". When he asked Jibra'īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ who was referred to by "Nujabā", he replied that it referred to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his offspring. This document had many golden seals. The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ thus handed the document to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and instructed him to break one seal and act upon the directive contained therein. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then handed the document to Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He also broke a seal and acted upon the directive. He then gave the document to Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He broke a seal and found the following directive:
>
> > Set forth towards martyrdom with a group of people who will not attain martyrdom except with you. Sell yourself to Allah.
>
> He thus carried out the injunction. He then handed the document over to Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He broke a seal and found the following directive:
>
> > Sit with your head lowered, remain silent and be confined to your home, worshipping Allah till you meet your end.
>
> He did as instruct and then handed over the document to his son, Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He broke a seal and found the following directive:
>
> > Transmit ḥadīth to the people and issue legal verdicts, propagate the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt and be faithful to your righteous ancestors. Do not fear anyone in the matter of Allah, for none will be able to harm you.
>
> He acted upon this and then handed the document to his son, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He broke a seal and found the following directive:
>
> > Transmit ḥadīth to the people and issue legal verdicts, propagate the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt and be faithful to your righteous ancestors. You are certainly under divine protection.

> He did as instruct and then passed the document over to his son, Mūsā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. In this manner the document will eventually be passed over to Imām al-Mahdī.

Al-Kulaynī transmits another version of this narration on the authority of Mūsā ibn Kathīr. This version states that upon breaking the fifth seal (the seal of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) there was the following addition:

> And proclaim the truth in safety and in fear, and do not fear anyone except Allah.

Ponder over the words of this narration and see the emphatic prohibition of taqiyyah for Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. He was instructed to proclaim the truth in safety and in fear and yet he awards the highest honour to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ by referring to him as al-Ṣiddīq, which is the station after nubuwwah. He then goes on to curse all those who do not accept that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ holds the title of al-Ṣiddīq.

The curse of Imām al-Bāqir proves the legitimacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah

As much as this narration establishes the highest title for Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it conclusively determines that the Ahl al-Sunnah are upon the truth and the Shīʿah are deviated. It does so in the following manner...

Firstly, this narration subjects all variants of Shīʿī doctrine; Imāmiyyah or otherwise, to the curse of the 'infallible' Imām whose prayers are undoubtedly accepted. Forget, the Ahl al-Sunnah, even the Shīʿah would have no reservations about the validity of this curse. Based on this, it becomes absolutely certain that their claim of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, or their claim of being Muslims and people of faith is false in the sight of Allah and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ will reject their claims in the hereafter too.

Secondly, (since he was entrusted with directives in the document given to him) whatever ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ did was in accordance with the command of Allah and the waṣiyyah of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and was not on the basis of taqiyyah. Therefore, since he pledged his allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, it establishes their legitimacy to the post of khalīfah. Similarly, the marriage of his daughter, Umm Kulthūm to ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا was no less than divine instruction just as the marriage of Fāṭimah to ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. So, praise be to Allah that the truth has been established and falsehood has been exposed and the Shīʿah are left dumbfounded. All praise belongs to Allah.

An objection against Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ by the Shīʿah themselves

In a final attempt (and purely for the sake of argument) the Shīʿah could turn around and say that it certainly seems that the Book of Allah and the sayings of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt are two credible testimonies proving that the Ahl al-Sunnah are upon truth and that the Shīʿah are upon falsehood. The fact that these are credible testimonies are borne out by the following ḥadīth which is considered to be an authentic ḥadīth according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿī scholars:

> إنى تارك فيكم ما إن تمسكتم به لن تضلوا بعدى أحدهما أعظم من الآخر
> كتاب الله حبل ممدود من السماء إلى الأرض وعترتى أهل بيتى ولن يتفرقا
>
> I am leaving behind two weighty things after me; you will not deviate as long as you hold on to them. One of them has greater status than the other; the Book of Allah, a continuous rope (of Allah) from the heavens unto the earth and my family members. They will never part with each other.

However, after one accepts that these are two credible testimonies then the Shīʿī assertions, which they base upon what has been narrated to them from their 'infallible' Imāms, entitles them to the curse of Imām al-Bāqir since rejection of the title of al-Ṣiddīq is unanimously agreed upon by all their leaders. Therefore, rejecting this position of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ discredits all of them as Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ said that their speech should not be accepted if they reject the position of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ (the rejection of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ discredits all of them).

In addition to this, (if the Shīʿah were to say that) most of our prominent leaders and credible transmitters were disbelievers and infidels and they have been classified as such by Shīʿī standards. Consequently, the situation of some of their prominent figures has been dealt with under the discussion of the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ. As for the rest of them, it is best that their condition be left vague. As for Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ has declared him to be an inmate of Jahannam, and this is recorded in their authentic references on the authority of Ibn Sammān.

Qādhī Nūr Allāh says that Zurārah's four brothers — Hamrān, ʿAbd al-Malik, Bukhayr, and ʿAbd al-Rahmān — as well as his sons — Ḥasan and Ḥusayn — his nephews — Ḥamzah, Muḥammad, Khuraysh, ʿAbd Allāh, Jaḥm, ʿAbd al-Majīd, ʿAbd al-Aʿlā, and ʿUmar; all shared the same views as Zurārah. Therefore, all of them maintained the view that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ was ignorant at some point in the past,

Allah forbid. As a result of this belief, they disbelieve in the following verse of the Noble Qur'ān:

وَكُنَّا بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عٰلِمِيْنَ

And We are ever, of all things, Knowing.[1]

The verdict regarding one who rejects a single verse of the Qur'an or even less is abundantly clear.

(So if the Shīʿah were to say that) When this is the condition of our prominent figures, what could be said about the multitude of weak narrators and those who are clouded in obscurity? Therefore, we cannot accept their transmissions (from the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt at all), which leaves the Ahl al-Sunnah with only one credible witness instead of the required two. This credible witness is the Noble Qur'ān, which has been profusely transmitted throughout the generations by the highest standards of transmission. As for the testimony of the Ahl al-Bayt, it could only be accepted if it matches the transmission by which the Qur'ān has been transmitted. This fundamentally requires every link in the chain to be a Muslim who is upright and credible and since all our narrators are either infidels or obscure, we have no conviction on any of their narrations. Since you have only one credible testimony we are compelled to reject the honourable status of the Ṣaḥābah, even though we had to absolve ourselves of any affiliation to our faith and expose the true identity of our scholars in the process.

There are many responses to this type of rationale but for now we would rather rest our case, as you were compelled to actually uproot the foundation of your entire faith.

Nevertheless, for our own purposes we have established through the Noble Qur'ān and the testimony of the Ahl al-Bayt (i.e. the Thaqalayn) that the Shīʿah faith is baseless and this is all we wanted to achieve. It now seems appropriate to refer to the letter of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and we will record it hereunder verbatim so that the reader may fully appreciate the worth of our response to it.

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 81.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter

Respected Mīr ṣāḥib

I have received your letter and read its contents. You have stated that you are not convinced about the Shīʿī stance pertaining to the estate of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. The actual reason for your misgivings is that you have not come into contact with a proficient scholar as yet. If you were to have met me and heard the accurate explanation from me, you would have realised that the Ahl al-Sunnah are in grave error, holding on to the wrong view and deceiving people about the actual state of affairs.

As for the three issues which you have referred to on behalf of ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq, the summary of this is as follows:

Firstly, the issue regarding the marriage of the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughters; this question is irrelevant because Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and she was wed to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As for the remaining two daughters whom the Ahl al-Sunnah ascribe to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they were actually the daughters of Khadījah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا previous husband. Their names are Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthūm. Ibn Ḥajar, who is a muḥaddith of the Ahl al-Sunnah, records in *al-Iṣābah* that one of these two were married to ʿUtbah, the son of Abū Lahab, and the other was married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ, and both these men were disbelievers. They then married ʿUthmān. However, despite Islam gaining authority and dominance they remained in wedlock to disbelievers and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not even bother to terminate their relationships with these disbelievers, so what if they were wed to ʿUthmān thereafter?

As for ʿUthmān, he was a believer and far better than those disbelievers whom they were initially attached to. However, ʿUthmān is responsible for such innovations after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that ʿĀ'ishah said the following regarding him:

أقتلوا نعثلا ، لعن الله نعثلا ، أقتلوا حراق المصاحف

> **Kill this long-bearded one! Curse be upon the long-bearded one! Kill the one who has burnt the copies of the Qur'ān.**

His innovations reached such proportions that it compelled the Ṣaḥābah to murder him. These reports are accurately recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and if you require a reference for them, I will despatch it to you.

Nevertheless, even if we were to assume that these two were the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ, then we would certainly have some reports highlighting their merit just as how the merit of Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as in the books of the Shīʿah. Consider the following in regard to Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها:

سيدة نساء العالمين

Queen of the women of the universe.

سيدة نساء أهل الجنة

Queen of the women of Jannah.

الفاطمة بضعة مني

Fāṭimah is a portion of me.

If these two were indeed the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ, there certainly would have been reports about their status and significance, but this is not the case.

As for the second issue, you have stated that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه fought many battles against ʿĀ'ishah, therefore if the three companions Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān usurped the Fadak Estate, why did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه not wage jihād against them? This issue is also incorrect because ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not fight many battles with ʿĀ'ishah. He only fought one battle in which he was victorious and this is also recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. As for usurping the Fadak Estate, this does not necessitate jihād since jihād is a holy war; not a war for wealth and worldly possessions. Therefore, the Ambiyā' and the Imāms only wage jihād for the upliftment of dīn, not for worldly pursuits.

Similarly, when did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه ever have supporters with whom he could have waged jihād? Consequently, jihād is only mandatory when one has a reasonable group of supporters. This is why jihād was not ordained upon the Prophet ﷺ in the Makkan period. When he migrated from Makkah on account of fear of the disbelievers and relocated to Madīnah, he waged war with the help of the Anṣār. However, as long as he remained in Makkah, he was overwhelmed even though he had a handful of supporters. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was one of these faithful supporters but he was also helpless. Ultimately, they all left Makkah in fear. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه faced similar circumstances during the reign of the three Khulafā' and he was unable to wage jihād. However, when he had considerable support, he waged war against ʿĀ'ishah and against Muʿāwiyah.

As for the third issue, it relates to the marriage of ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ daughters. The answer to this is that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had two daughters from his marriage to Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Zaynab, the elder of the two, who was married to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār and the younger, Umm Kulthūm, who was married to Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār. This is briefly the answer to your question, and had you requested more details on the issue, it would have been dispatched.

As for the issue of Fadak, it demands a lengthy response but I would suffice with a summary of it. If you are fair and unbiased then this will suffice. Similarly, this response is in accordance with that which is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah; anyone who doubts this is free to check this response against their original references and then determine whether they are guilty of oppression or not.

Consequently, Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī (in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*), ʿAlī Muttaqī (in *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*), Abū Yaʿlā Mawṣilī and the author of *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* and many other scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that when the following verse was revealed, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, who the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to and what was their right:

وآت ذا القربي حقه

Upon which Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said that the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to Fāṭimah, and that Fadak was her right. Consequently, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ assigned Fadak to Fāṭimah. The reports which these scholars record establishes that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah and that it belonged solely to her.

When the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left this world and Abū Bakr succeeded him, he took Fadak away forcefully and deprived her of any rights to it. Is this not usurpation? Consider the following, Tārīkh al-ʿAbbās, which is a credible Sunnī reference states that when the progeny of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn claimed the Fadak estate from the Khalīfah Ma'mūn al-Rashīd, he gathered two hundred scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah and instructed them to explain the true nature of affairs regarding Fadak. These scholars transmitted on the authority of Wāqidī and Bashīr ibn Walīd that the afore-mentioned verse was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ who was referred to by the term "Dhū al-Qurbā" and what were their rights. Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ informed him that Fāṭimah was his closest relative and Fadak was her sole right. The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then gave Fadak to her, which Abū Bakr snatched away when he became the khalīfah. When Fāṭimah

رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا disputed this matter and claimed what was rightfully her inheritance, Abū Bakr apologized and intended to write a document restoring her rights upon it. Upon this, ʿUmar said that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا should be asked to present witnesses who could testify that the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had given Fadak to her. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا then presented ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا, who was a righteous woman, as well as Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ as witnesses and they testified in her favour. Abū Bakr then wrote out the document and restored it to her but ʿUmar snatched the document and tore it to pieces. He objected that since ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا husband, his testimony in her favour was not valid. Abū Bakr agreed with this view.

This incident of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا asking for Fadak and presenting ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا and her two sons as witnesses, and Abū Bakr's ultimate rejection is recorded in many books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, such as *Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah*, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, *Muʿjam al-Buldān*, *Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah*, *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*, the *Tārīkh* of al-Ḥākim, *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*, *Sharḥ Mawāqif*, *Nihāyah al-ʿUqūl* and many other books.

Therefore, Abū Bakr considered Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا and her witnesses as liars. However, when others made claims, he accepted their word without asking them to present witnesses and handed over what they were claiming.

Consequently, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* reports that Jābir went to Abū Bakr and told him that the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had promised him a considerable sum of money from the revenue of Bahrain but he departed from this world before it came. Jābir said that since the revenue of Bahrain had arrived in the era of Abū Bakr, he now asks him to honour the promise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Jābir relates that Abū Bakr gave him three handfuls of wealth without asking him to produce any witness to the words of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Fatḥ al-Bārī, which is a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, records the reason for Abū Bakr giving the wealth without asking for any testimony. It states that Abū Bakr felt that it was impossible for a Ṣaḥābī such as Jābir to make a false claim against the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If Jābir was a doubtful character, then who could ever be considered truthful thereafter? Therefore, Abū Bakr did not ask him to produce any witness.

I say, how absurd is the religiosity of the Ahl al-Sunnah! They have no regard for Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا, who is the apple of the Prophet's صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ eye, yet they have such high regard for a lowly companion like Jābir. They consider Jābir credible and refrain from branding him a liar whilst Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا is not

and she is compelled to present witnesses who are then dishonoured and discredited. They say that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the husband and his testimony may have a motive. Therefore, they consider ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a liar whereas he too is a Ṣaḥābī, but unfortunately, he is less than Jābir. As for Hasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they are her sons and their testimony may also have a motive. This leaves Umm Ayman all alone and the testimony of a single woman falls short of the minimum requirement.

Now you decide whether this is injustice and oppression or not? If this is not usurpation, then what is? Similarly, is this classified as hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt or love? Is this what the rights of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demand? The truth of the matter is that the Ahl al-Sunnah have such enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt that it makes them overlook the rights of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

You have stated that you were not convinced about the Shīʿah stance of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Fatimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Now, I ask you to record the response of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the light of what I have written. Ask them why Jābir was considered truthful and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not credible despite her presenting witnesses. Similarly, when she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself. He said that he heard the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying that the material possessions of the Ambiyā' should be disposed of as charity and none of it would be for their heirs. In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed of in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.

Despite all of this, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا once again came to Abū Bakr whilst he was on the pulpit and said to him: "How strange is it that your daughter will have a share of your inheritance but I have no share of my fathers' wealth?" Upon this, Abū Bakr descended from the pulpit and wrote the document restoring her ownership. However, ʿUmar came along and enquired about the document once again. He tore the document and disputed Abū Bakr's decision. He said that they were preoccupied with wars against the Arabs and this was no time for such an issue. Ṣibt ibn al-Jawzī records this narration in his *Sīrah*.

Wāqidī, who is a muḥaddith of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalbī state in their reports that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا came to Abū Bakr and laid a claim to Fadak saying that her father had given it to her. Abū Bakr wrote a document handing Fadak over to her. As she was on her way back, she came upon ʿUmar and he enquired about the document she had with her. ʿUmar then snatched the document and tore it to pieces.

If someone were to say that Abū Bakr is surely not at fault since he had written the document then we would say that being the khalīfah, he was not subjected to ʿUmar in any way and he should have opposed him and reprimanded him. However, he agreed with ʿUmar and never took any decision without consulting ʿUmar first.

Similarly, if ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah believed the fabricated narration of Abū Bakr regarding the inheritance of the Ambiyā' then why did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ raise this issue once again with ʿUmar during his reign as the khalīfah? On that occasion, ʿUmar told them that they considered Abū Bakr to be a liar, a cheat, a deceiver and a transgressor and they harboured the very same thoughts about him, but he would do nothing more than what Abū Bakr had done about the matter. This narration is recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*.

The *Musnad* of Aḥmad records that this matter was raised once again with ʿUthmān during his reign. Therefore, if Abū Bakr was truthful, they would never have claimed Fadak from him. This establishes that Abū Bakr forged the narration and he usurped Fadak from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا due to his hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt. Similarly, ʿUmar highlighted to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that they considered Abū Bakr to be a fraud and a liar and they have the same sentiments for him. So, when ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ considers them to be liars and cheats, then we will do the same. This is the true narrative regarding the Fadak Estate.

***Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* adds that when Abū Bakr refused to hand over Fadak then Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا became angry and refused to speak to him ever again. Similarly, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* records that when she was leaving this world, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar should not attend her funeral ceremony.**

Response to the letter

The above is a word-for-word reproduction of ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter. Now be prepared to deliberate on our response so that the reality of his letter may be exposed and the prudence and insight of Shīʿī scholars may be uncovered. Whilst it seems to contain lengthy allegations and criticism, it is void of substance. It contains three or four objections which are essentially invalid. If you do not believe this, then let us assess them.

Firstly, ʿAmmār ʿAlī says that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. As for the two daughters, whom the Ahl al-Sunnah ascribe to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they are not his biological daughters. Instead, they were the daughters of Khadījah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا from her previous husband.

It is rather pleasing that ʿAmmār ʿAlī attributes them to Khadījah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. We are grateful for this degree of injustice too, because just as he has disassociated them from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, some of these enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt actually sever their link from Khadījah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا as well.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has stooped to the lowest levels of shamelessness by asserting that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. His opposition to the Ahl al-Sunnah has resulted in the loss of his īmān, let alone the injustice committed against the sacred household of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In adopting this stance, he disregards the Noble Qur'ān and his own authentic books as well.

Four Daughters of the Prophet ﷺ

The Qur'ān attests to the Prophet ﷺ having multiple daughters

Those who have any sense of justice should consider my words and feel free to object if they find any cause for concern. Consequently, the Noble Qur'ān establishes that the Prophet ﷺ had many daughters, but if the Shīʿah are unaware by this because of their inability to retain the Qur'ān to memory then we would cite the verse for their convenience:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ قُلْ لِّأَزْوَاجِكَ وَبَنَاتِكَ وَنِسَاءِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ يُدْنِيْنَ عَلَيْهِنَّ مِنْ جَلَابِيْبِهِنَّ

O Prophet, tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to bring down over themselves [part] of their outer garments.[1]

Now it is not too difficult for ʿAmmār ʿAlī to understand that the word *Banāt* (daughters) appears in plural form. A plural noun signifies at least three characters, but even if the Arabs at times may refer to dual with a plural noun, it will still imply that the Prophet ﷺ had more than one biological daughter. Therefore, the claim that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only biological daughter still remains incorrect and it is in conflict with the Qur'ān. It is regrettable that ʿAmmār ʿAlī was not deterred by the thought that his deception may be exposed to others and as a result felt no shame in doing so.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has no choice aside from accepting that the Prophet ﷺ had many daughters and they are Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها, Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها and Zaynab رضي الله عنها, since no other female has claimed to be the daughter of the Prophet ﷺ. If he fails to acknowledge this, then the following verse of the Qur'ān will apply to him:

وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِأٰيَاتِنَا إِلَّا الْكَافِرُوْنَ

And none reject Our verses except the disbelievers.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 59.

2 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 47.

If he is still adamant and chooses to remain a disbeliever by claiming that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only biological daughter, then we have no alternative other than referring to authentic Shīʿī texts to support our claim. Surely he could not refute his own sources, but if he does, then this would only add to our delight.

The number of the Prophet's ﷺ daughters in light of Shīʿī references

Perhaps a few quotations from Shīʿī references would settle this matter. *Nahj al-Balāghah* enjoys the status of a divine scripture according to the understanding of the Shīʿah and its contents are no less than the Qur'ān in authenticity. The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah maintain that its transmission is classified as *Mutawātir*[1]. ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī—the author—records the following statement of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

> قد بلغت من صهره صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم ما لم ينالا ، يعني الشيخين
>
> You have secured a link through marriage to him [the Prophet ﷺ] which they have not.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ basically highlights one of the merits of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ over Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in that he was blessed to be the son-in-law of the Prophet ﷺ twice over.

Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī—*Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah*—records the following from Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in *al-Tahdhīb*, which is one of the four authentic 'ḥadīth' texts of the Shīʿah and which is on par with the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī.

> كان يقول في دعائه ، أللهم صلى على رقية بنت نبيك – أللهم صلى على أم كلثوم بنت نبيك
>
> Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ used to say the following in his supplications:
>
> O Allah! Shower your favours upon Ruqayyah, the daughter of your Messenger. O Allah! Shower your favours upon Umm Kulthūm, the daughter of your Messenger.

However, if even this is not satisfactory for ʿAmmār ʿAlī and he asserts that they were referred to as the Prophet's ﷺ daughters on the basis of common

1 *Mutawātir*: A ḥadīth reported by such a large number of people that it is inconceivable for them to have all agreed upon a lie.

terminology (just as Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام referred to the believing women among his followers as his daughters), then we will be even more determined to make him surrender. Consequently, the following narration appears in the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī:

> تزوّج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم خديجة وهو إبن بضع و عشرين سنة ، فوُلد له منها قبل بعثه عليه السلام القاسم و رقية و زينب وأم كلثوم ، وولد له بعد المبعث الطيب والطاهر و فاطمة
>
> The Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was over twenty at the time of his marriage to Khadījah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. This marriage bore him four children prior to receiving Nubuwwah, namely Qāsim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, Zaynab رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. As for those who were born after he received Nubuwwah, they were Ṭāhir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ṭayyab رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا.

There is no possibility of any alternate interpretation to this narration. Neither could it be said that these were referred to as the Prophet's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughters on the basis of common terminology. This narration also establishes that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had three other daughters besides Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, which is the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are Zaynab رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا.

Strangely though, ʿAmmār ʿAlī's extreme caution even prevented him from saying that the Ahl al-Sunnah believe that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had three daughters besides Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. Perhaps he felt that it is best to subdue the opponents view as best as one can.

And what to say about his in-depth and all-encompassing information! Subḥān Allah! He skilfully lists dozens of texts and references of the Ahl al-Sunnah as if he has perused each one of them, when he is ignorant about the basic beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah which is known to every Sunnī; what chance is there of him ever perusing these texts? He probably heard the names of these references as a student and then lists them as if he is intimately acquainted with them. In fact, he may have not seen some of the references cited regarding the Estate of Fadak in his dreams as well; references such as *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* and the *Musnad Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* (as they were not available in print at that time). When this is the reality of his 'association' with these references, there is no need to respond to what he ascribes to them.

No significance recorded about the other daughters

However, it is necessary for us to acknowledge the simple-mindedness of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. In order to establish that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only biological daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ he states:

> **Nevertheless, even if we were to assume that these two were the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then we would certainly have some reports highlighting their merit just as how the merit of Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as in the books of the Shīʿah.**

Is this adequate proof and can this really be considered a justification for their claim? If ʿAmmār ʿAlī was not acquainted with the laws of justification and substantiation, he ought to have asked somebody at least. After all, everything that is written in his letter is but the opinion and views of others which he copied without taking any pain to verify.

Nevertheless, from the point of logic and reason this much is established that not mentioning something does not necessarily imply its non-existence but perhaps you would object to this, since you only accept proof and evidence that is based on narration and your extreme piety simply cannot tolerate any mention of subjects such as logic. So here is a portion of a verse which appears towards the end of Sūrah al-Nisā':

وَرُسُلًا قَدْ قَصَصْنٰهُمْ عَلَيْكَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَرُسُلًا لَّمْ نَقْصُصْهُمْ عَلَيْكَ

And [We sent] Messengers about whom We have related [their stories] to you before and Messengers about whom We have not related to you.[1]

Therefore, if failing to mention them necessitates their non-existence then this would result in negating the rest of the Ambiyā' who have not been mentioned in the Qur'ān, Allah forbid!

Similarly, is it necessary that all the offspring of a saint attain the same rank and position (or do they have different potentials)? If ʿAmmār ʿAlī asserts that they should all be equal than he should think carefully before taking such a view as this

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 164.

would demand that Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ and his brother Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ—the martyr—also have the same rank. Perhaps he alleges that the Ahl al-Sunnah consider Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا to be on the same rank; never and again I say never: the rank of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is uniquely enjoyed by her alone.

That is the bounty of Allah; He grants his grace to whomsoever He wishes.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in History

As for his statements that between Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Ruqayyah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا, one of them happened to be married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, this is glaring testimony of the marvellous retention capacity of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. My dear sir, it was Zaynab رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا who was married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The other two daughters were initially wed to the two sons of Abū Lahab. Why do you tarnish the name of Ibn Ḥajar when you are guilty of committing the error? You commit the crime and someone else is the villain?

As for his statement that in spite of the dominance of Islam they still remained in marriage to disbelievers, this is a true height of audacity. Subḥān Allah! If they were not the biological daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they certainly were the biological daughters of Khadījah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا. We believe that the Shīʿah too have that much regard for Khadījah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا that they would consider her daughters to be Muslims.

Whether anyone understands this or not, the fact remains that ʿAmmār ʿAlī himself considers them to be Muslims. If he really considered them to be disbelievers, then what was the need for the remark:

However, despite Islam gaining authority and dominance they remained in wedlock to disbelievers and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not even bother to terminate their relationships with these disbelievers, so what if they were wed to ʿUthmān thereafter? As for ʿUthmān, he was a believer and far better than those disbelievers whom they were initially attached to.

In addition to this, could any Muslim ever entertain the thought that let alone his own daughters, would the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ever allow even the least virtuous of the believing women to remain in marriage to a disbeliever when Islam was dominant?

The order of the Qur'ān to extricate Muslim women from the control of disbelievers

Forget the obligation of the Prophet ﷺ in this regard, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ obligates every ordinary Muslim to release Muslim women from the clutches of the disbelievers. Read the following verse if you are not convinced about this:

وَمَا لَكُمْ لَا تُقَاتِلُوْنَ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَالْمُسْتَضْعَفِيْنَ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوِلْدَانِ الَّذِيْنَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا أَخْرِجْنَا مِنْ هٰذِهِ الْقَرْيَةِ الظَّالِمِ أَهْلُهَا وَاجْعَلْ لَّنَا مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا وَّاجْعَلْ لَّنَا مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ نَصِيْرًا

And what is [the matter] with you that you fight not in the cause of Allah and [for] the oppressed among men, women, and children who say, "Our Lord, take us out of this city of oppressive people and appoint for us from Yourself a protector and appoint for us from Yourself a helper?"[1]

Even the Shīʿah are aware that these verses were revealed prior to the Conquest of Makkah, when Islam was not yet a force to be reckoned with, so there is no question of the Prophet ﷺ not having the free will to do as he wished with the Arabs. So, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī is implying that the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ were in Makkah till the moment of the revelation of these verses, then not only is this in conflict with the true facts, it is also a subtle but direct objection against the Prophet ﷺ. However, if they say that the Prophet ﷺ came to Madīnah long before the revelation of this verse, then we would ask what authority did the Prophet ﷺ actually have that he preferred them remaining in wedlock to disbelievers.

However, if we are asked to state the facts then we would inform them that these two daughters were married to ʿUtbah and ʿUtaybah, the sons of Abū Lahab, prior to the Nubuwwah of the Prophet ﷺ. After the Prophet ﷺ announced his Nubuwwah, and Abū Lahab became his avowed enemy, Abū Lahab instructed his sons to divorce the Prophet's ﷺ daughters. Thereafter one of them was married to ʿUthmān ﷺ and both daughters arrived in Madīnah Munawwarah in the very first year of the *hijrah* (emigration). At the time of the Battle of Badr,

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 75.

which took place in the second year after hijrah, one of these daughters who was already married to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, fell seriously ill. It was on account of her critical illness that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was instructed to remain behind in Madīnah; but it seems that accurately reporting history has terminated on ʿAmmār ʿAlī such that he has resorted to distorting the facts as he desires.

The merits of ʿUthmān, Dhū al-Nūrayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

As for the remaining allegations against ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, by which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has invited destruction and doom upon himself, we disassociate ourselves from it completely. In our view, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are dear and equal to us like our two eyes but ʿAmmār ʿAlī knows far better and he is in a divine position to pass judgement against him.

As for alleging that he introduced innovations, we would have responded to it had we not previously established the lofty status of the three Khulafā especially, and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah in general, when deliberating on the following verse and verses subsequent to it:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ

> *Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth just as He granted it to those before them.*

Therefore, there is no point in responding to these hollow criticisms.

As for attributing the following narration to ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا these are but fabrications of Ibn Qutaybah and Aʿtham al-Kūfī al-Simsātī:

أقتلوا نعثلا ، لعن الله نعثلا ، أقتلوا حراق المصاحف

> Kill this long-bearded one! Curse be upon the long-bearded one! Kill the one who has burnt the copies of the Qur'ān.

The above individuals were extremist Shīʿah and wretched liars, notorious for their fabrications. Attributing their words to ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is like the proverb:

> *You pass wind and then blame someone else.*

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has no shame, stating that such fabricated reports are quoted from authentic works of the Ahl al-Sunnah is another blatant lie.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Arabic

You are already aware of the true state of affairs regarding the person who claims to have sound knowledge and proficiency over voluminous Arabic resources of the Ahl al-Sunnah but if you require additional clarification then consider that the verb *Uqtulū* is a verb in plural format, but he has translated it as a singular verb. However, we may overlook this as an innocent mistake which could happen to anyone. However, what should we say then about translating the phrase *Laʿan Allāh* as "curse be upon". Surely there is a distinction between the past tense and an injunction. One really wonders what standards such translations conform to. If a student who is studying primary texts such as *Mīzān* is given the meaning of the root word, he would accurately translate the verbs *Uqtulū* and *Laʿan*, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who has become the supreme leader of the Shīʿah Imāmiyyah, on account of this highly academic treatise cannot decipher between the injunction and the past tense, between singular and plural. We would have to accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is not even aware of the rudiments of Arabic grammar and that his lengthy garb and burdensome turban is but a deception. Whatever knowledge he claims to have must have been heard and received from others, yet he portrays himself to the innocent masses as a highly proficient scholar. Perhaps he has gained some basic knowledge but on account of the verse of the Qur'ān:

وَاللّٰهُ لَا يَهْدِيْ الْقَوْمَ الظّٰلِمِيْنَ

And Allah does not guide the wrong-doers.[1]

He was unable to translate it accurately; as he is guilty of harbouring evil opinions about the chosen servants of Allah, the honourable Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Despite such pathetic academic ability, he is willing to debate the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah, whose path conforms completely with the path of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and he freely quotes references with sophisticated titles which can only be truly appreciated by a qualified scholar. Anyone who considers these flaws would realise that if we ruled out deceit as an objective, we would have to accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's treatise is subject to many defects and misconceptions.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 258.

On the other hand, if these reports were to have been authentically reported in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, then we would have been able to respond to it adequately. Yes, these reports are certainly recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah but they are not recorded without their status being clarified as fabrications and baseless reports of the Shīʿah. Whilst this was the actual motive for recording them, ʿAmmār ʿAlī found it convenient to use it for his purposes. If this is how texts are supposed to be distorted, very soon he would probably change the law of discharging alms from the Qur'ān by misconstruing the following verse:

وَلَا يَحْسَبَنَّ الَّذِيْنَ يَبْخَلُوْنَ بِمَا أٰتَاهُمُ اللّٰهُ مِنْ فَضْلِهٖ هُوَ خَيْرًا لَّهُمْ

And let not those who [greedily] withhold what Allah has given them of His bounty ever think that it is better for them.[1]

Because *It is better for them* appears at the end [so he might construe that failing to discharge the Zakāh is the best course of action even though impermissible-*translator*.

He also might consider Firʿawn to be the Rabb, Most-High, since the following appears in the Qur'ān regarding him:

فَقَالَ اَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْاَعْلٰى

He (Firʿawn) said, "I am your Rabb, Most High."[2]

Similarly, his assertion that *Al-Istīʿāb* contains the report that the Ṣaḥābah ultimately killed ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ as they could no longer tolerate the manner in which he had disfigured the dīn, is slander and distortion of the facts. Everyone is aware that the Ahl al-Sunnah have no objections against ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ and they acknowledge his lofty position whole-heartedly. Similarly, the Ahl al-Sunnah consider those associated with bidʿah to be deviated and they oppose them uncompromisingly. Why should they not oppose those engaged in bidʿah when bidʿah by its very nature calls for the destruction of the Sunnah? Therefore, if there were any authentic texts ascribing bidʿah to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, the Ahl al-Sunnah, by virtue of what this title implies, would have been first to disassociate themselves from ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, Allah forbid!

---

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 180.

2 Sūrah al-Nāziʿāt: 24.

The allegation of bidʿah against ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has been masterminded by ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his peers, and they have trespassed all limits in their allegations against him.

If any sensible person were to analyse these allegations they would conclude that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is certainly an agent of Dajjāl, if not a Dajjāl himself. We have never seen such deceivers nor heard of them before. If he were to have only concealed the narrations contained in Shīʿī references, which prove that Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and her sisters رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا were indeed the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then he could have gotten away with it. Since the possibility of a Sunnī being acquainted with the contents of Shīʿī sources is slim but what can be said about his utter shamelessness; he forges narrations and ascribes them to authentic Sunnī texts (and then expects that the Ahl al-Sunnah would not be aware of these lies).

The support for ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah

It would be foolish to expect decency from those who have no vestige of *ḥayā* (modesty). It is therefore necessary to establish from authentic sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah the support given to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah in general, and their willingness to defend him at all costs, so that simple-minded Muslims may not be swayed by the deception of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. These facts may possibly serve as an eye-opener for ʿAmmār ʿAlī as well.

The claims he has made are so absurd and biased that the learned and the illiterate alike can see its falsity. In essence, the confrontation that occurred between Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ʿĀʾishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was only on account of seeking retribution for the assassination of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Since the killers of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were hiding in the camp of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It was difficult for him to deal with them immediately on account of their large numbers and their rebellious nature. These people felt that if they had successfully brought about the end of the reign of one khalīfah, what could stop them from doing it again. As for Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they felt that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not dealing swiftly with the matter. As for Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his forces, they thought that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was murdered by the incitation of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (due to the propaganda of the rebels).

Nevertheless, the historical records of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah are available for recourse. The Ṣaḥābah made every effort to subdue the rebels but what was divinely ordained had to occur. The Ṣaḥābah initially resorted to dialogue with the rebels but when their attempts were met with failure, they sought permission to wage war against them from ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. ʿUthmān was not prepared to entertain this idea and the Ṣaḥābah were left with no option but to allow matters to take its course. Despite this, they made attempts to the very end to deliver water to him and to drive the rebels away. Zayd bin Thābit رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ along with a group of Anṣār offered to fulfil their role as the helpers of the dīn of Allah once again.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and told him that these rebels were the very same people who came into Islam after being defeated by the Ṣaḥābah and the era of their defeat was still fresh in their minds. However, they have used their declaration of faith as a shield knowing that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would honour such a declaration and be restricted by it. Ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that if ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ permitted, the Ṣaḥābah would once again deal with them and remind them of the manner in which they had suffered defeat and humiliation not too long ago. ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ disapproved of this and did not want the blood of the Muslims to be spilled in defence of his life.

Similarly, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allah ibn Zubayr, Abū Hurayrah, ʿĀmir ibn Rabīʿ and many other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ remained with ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his home and whenever the rebels attempted to enter his home, they repelled them with sticks and stones and secured the entrance once again.

As for the slaves of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they were a force on their own. They gathered their arms and begged ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to allow them to deal with these rebels. They told him that since they had played glorious roles in the conquests of the Muslims from Khurāsān to Africa, they would settle the matter decisively and teach the rebels a lesson. The rebels were using the declaration of faith as a shield and they were immune to the words of the senior Companions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

However, ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only responded by saying that if they wished to please him, they should disarm and remain confined to their homes. He also offered freedom to those among them who disarmed. He said that he would prefer to die before any blood was spilt as opposed to dying after blood was spilt. Since he was promised

martyrdom, he would meet his coveted end any way. What was the benefit in spilling the blood of others too, when he was to be martyred all the same?

Sunnī and Shīʿī reports state that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ assigned his sons, the children of Jaʿfar and his slave Qambar to the door of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also assigned their sons to the same post, so that they could repel the rebels. Thus, whenever the rebels advanced they would be repulsed with sticks and staffs. This confrontation led to Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sustaining many wounds. Muḥammad ibn Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Qambar sustained head injuries. When the rebels realised that they could not advance from the main entrance they proceeded from the rear and entered the home of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after forcing entry through the rear wall of his neighbours from the Anṣār. They then succeeded in assassinating ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ defends Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

A report from *Nahj al-Balāghah*, the most authentic Shīʿī reference, contains the following words of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

والله لقد دفعت عنه

By the oath of Allah; I repelled the rebels from ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

The Shīʿī scholars comment on this by saying that when the rebels laid siege to the home of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ visited him on many occasions and he would repel and curse the rebels every time he came and went.

Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī, the notorious Shīʿī historian and one who bears intense hatred for ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and other Ṣaḥābah, records in *al-Futūḥ* that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sent Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, to inform him that he had his complete support and that he was aware of the false allegations of the rebels and their resolve to assassinate him. He also said that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ feared that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could be harmed and he was ready to stand by his side and defend him against the rebels and ward them off by all means possible if ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ permitted this.

Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ relayed this message but ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that he did not want ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to undertake any hardship or confront the rebels. He told Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he had seen the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in his dream telling him that if he fought against the rebels, he would be victorious, but if he did not fight them then he would terminate his fast with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He then expressed his desire to be reunited with

the Prophet ﷺ and to terminate his fast in his blessed company. Ḥasan رضي الله عنه was left with no choice.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was not displaying hypocritical behaviour

No sincere Muslim will ever suggest that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was hypocritical in his actions and dealings. If the Shīʿah maintain that this was hypocritical behaviour on the basis of

المرؤ يقيس على نفسه

A man judges others by his own standards.

then who has endorsed the īmān of the Shīʿah? Allah forbid that any allegations of hypocrisy be made against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

If by an impossible assumption, it is agreed that he certainly was hypocritical at this juncture then what pressure was he possibly bowing to when he delivered the sermon in Kūfah wherein he stated under oath that he had repelled the murderers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه several times. ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه was history by that time and complete authority rested with ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Even a coward does not fear a deceased enemy, and he would not care less about being unarmed before the corpse of his enemy. Why is it that despite his valour and bravery, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was still terrified of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه? If the Shīʿah claim that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had double standards, then why would he make such clear declarations even when ʿUthmān ﷺ was no longer a threat?

The effort of other Ṣaḥābah in defending ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه

On the other hand, ʿAbd Allah ibn Salām رضي الله عنه repeatedly asked the rebels to refrain from assassinating ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, as his demise would open the flood-gates of mischief and strife. As for Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه, who possessed knowledge of the names of the hypocrites, which ʿAlī رضي الله عنه affirmed and testified to, Shīʿī references state that he exhorted the rebels to desist from executing their plot. He cautioned them that the martyrdom of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه would result in many trials and tribulations.

Now if anyone were to ask ʿAmmār ʿAlī about the above mentioned people; were they not the Ṣaḥābah? As for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, he alone is equivalent to thousands of

Ṣaḥābah, especially according to the Shīʿah. So if the Ṣaḥābah were the ones who killed ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who is a great Ṣaḥābī, was opposed to this. Strangely though, ʿAmmār ʿAlī alleges that it is the Ṣaḥābah who ultimately killed ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then it struck me suddenly that ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the rest of the Shīʿah leadership do not consider the above-mentioned people (including ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) to be Ṣaḥābah. Instead, the Ṣaḥābah according to them were the villains and rebels of Kūfah and Egypt, the actual people who gathered and marched to assassinate ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, his claim that the Ṣaḥābah murdered ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is correct by his own definition of Ṣaḥābah.

Nevertheless, the reality is that his allegation against the Ṣaḥābah is vicious slander and misrepresentation of the facts. One who has no fear of Allah and no shame for people is capable of almost anything. We are still baffled by his audacity, that he states he is willing to forward the chain of transmission for these fabricated reports and allegations for anyone who may require it.

Assessing the allegation of cowardice against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Regarding the conflict between ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, ʿAmmār ʿAlī rightfully states that there was only one confrontation and that these confrontations were not prompted by desire for wealth or worldly gain. Yet even though we are aware of the proverb:

الكذوب قد يصدق

A liar does speak the truth at times.

we have no clue why he did not lie at this juncture.

However, even though he is absolved of lying, he has intentionally ignored another reality. He says that it was not possible for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to wage jihād against the first three Khulafā' as he had no supporters. It is agreed that one person alone cannot face an entire army and support is essential. So, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ avoided confrontation with the disbelievers until after he gained the support of the Anṣār by migrating to Madīnah then what excuse does ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ have for not waging war all by himself when he has made glorious claims about himself?

ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī records the following in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which has the most sublime status in Shīʿī literature:

> قال أمير المؤمنين : إني والله لو لقيتُهم واحدا وهم طلاع الأرض كلَّها ما باليت ولا استوحشتُ ، وإني من ضلالتهم التي فيها والهدي الذي أنا عليه لعلى بصيرة من نفسي ، ويقين من ربي ، وإني إلى لقاء الله ولحسن ثوابه لمنتظر وراجٍ
>
> ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said: "Certainly by the oath of Allah, if I were to confront them all alone, and the entire earth was full of them, I would not be bothered nor would I feel any fear. And I have complete insight and conviction from my Rabb about the misguidance they are in and the guidance I am upon. And I am eager to meet my Rabb and I am hopeful of his handsome reward, anticipating it anxiously."

What support and help does he require, one who cares less if the entire world were against him and he were confronting them all by himself?

Yes, if the Imāms did not have control over their own lives then we could have said that not bothering or not fearing does not necessarily mean that he would not lose his life in the process. Therefore, it may have occurred to him that if I were to face them all by myself the chances of victory are far-fetched but if I am slain in the process then what is the benefit? The purpose of jihād is to elevate the dīn of Allah and if that cannot be accomplished then merely sacrificing one's life has no real purpose.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has control over his own life according to Shīʿah

Since the Imām has control over his own life as al-Kulaynī has established and the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are unanimous upon this, then waging jihād all by himself against the enemy would have had such positive effects for the upliftment of dīn much greater than waging jihād along with supporters. If he was able to survive the attack of the enemy whilst being surrounded by his supporters then it is no great accomplishment, but if he prevailed all by himself it would have been the most supernatural feat.

Hindus are thrilled and easily swayed by phenomenal feats. If they had to observe such a feat, they would not hesitate to declare their faith all at once. Therefore, if ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were to wage such a jihād once or twice only, the worst that could happen is that he would sustain wounds or lose consciousness but the impression that would have been created in the minds of people would have led friend and foe flocking into Islam. It would have outshone the achievements of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ by far since the disbelievers knew that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was dependent on his forces whenever he faced them in battle and since it was a question of might and military strength, they also entertained thoughts of defeating him and they mustered the courage to confront him again and again.

If ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fought those battles, then whatever was expected to be realised and achieved through Imām al-Mahdī would have been achieved long before and the Ahl al-Bayt would have been spared from the tribulations they faced.

But alas, not only did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ shirk from waging war against the three Khulafā', he also could not face up to them and say to them even a little of the truth which the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said to Abū Jahal, Abū Lahab, Walīd ibn ʿUtbah and Umayyah ibn Khalaf. Surprisingly, despite the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ unparalleled bravery and

courage, there is no similar narration highlighting these feats in any way. Moreover, the Prophet ﷺ opposed the disbelievers all by himself and endured such persecution and hardship that ultimately compelled him to bid farewell to his land of origin. Yet, despite such cowardice ʿAlī رضي الله عنه still remains the unparalleled hero.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه lived in fear and humiliation all his life according to the Shīʿah

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه never had even one opportunity in his life when he could proclaim the truth and endure hardship for the noble cause. Perhaps at the least he could have emigrated from Madīnah and earned the rewards of emigration. Instead he remained in their midst like one of them and continued to perform ṣalāh behind them, listening to their sermons on Fridays and ʿĪd celebrations. He even strengthened familial ties with them and passed his life in this manner. If not anything else, he could have at least avoided Taqiyyah as the Prophet ﷺ avoided Taqiyyah.

Therefore, it is baseless to say that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not wage jihād because he had no support. In fact, it is tantamount to disbelief in him as he said that he feared less even if the whole world confronted him and he was all alone. Added to this is that he was in control of his own life and his chances of prevailing were certain. How could ʿAmmār ʿAlī then say that he required support to wage jihād.

Similarly, if one were to page through Shīʿī references one would find reports stating that all the Anṣār of the Prophet ﷺ remained loyal to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Therefore, when he had the support of the Anṣār and their progeny, why did he not wage jihād during the reign of the first three Khulafā'.

The truth is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه whole-heartedly supported the first three Khulafā' and he was loyal and devoted to them, especially the first two Khulafā', whom he continued to praise throughout his own reign as Khalīfah, wherein he was not experiencing circumstances necessitating Taqiyyah. The majority of the Imāmiyyah scholars maintain that Taqiyyah was prohibited upon him during his reign as the Khalīfah as has been established previously. Similarly, the first three Khulafā' were history by this time and who was ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to fear dead people.

Considering all these facts, as well as the phenomenal bravery, courage and firm faith of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه there is no other explanation other than stating that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه considered their Khilāfah legitimate and valid.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not stand up for Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا rights

Whilst ʿAmmār ʿAlī rightfully states that jihād is not waged for wealth and worldly matters, we would ask whether aiding the oppressed is part of Islam or not? And more so when the oppressed is none other than the beloved daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If helping such an oppressed person not an essential Islamic duty? Despite his phenomenal ability, the support of the Anṣār and their progenies, why then did he fail to help Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا? If she had forgiven her oppressors, then it would have been a different issue entirely but ʿAmmār ʿAlī says that she carried this grudge to her grave and refused to have anything to do with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. On the contrary if you insist that assisting the oppressed is a worldly matter and it has no relation with dīn then surely it would be prohibited to assist and there would be no reward for such an endeavour. In this situation, the objection of the Shīʿah against the Ṣaḥābah for failing to support ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is also futile.

However, we believe that ʿAmmār ʿAlī considers aiding the oppressed incumbent and regards it to be a part of Islam. This is because the Noble Qur'ān as well as aḥādīth records of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and Shīʿah for that matter, are filled with reports of this nature. However, since criticism of the Ṣaḥābah is the objective, they must be criticised even if ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ position is compromised in the process.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that our discussion on Taqiyyah thus far would compel ʿAmmār ʿAlī to agree, even if not verbally, that ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ pledge of allegiance to the first three Khulafā' and his silence on the issue of Fadak was on account of his belief that they were upon truth, and not Taqiyyah in any form.

As for what is to follow from here on, it will only give emphasis to what has been established thus far. It will impress on the minds of readers, who actually value ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and acknowledge his true worth. Are they—who do not consider his association with the three Khulafā' to be hypocritical but rather that it is was done seeking the pleasure of Allah—on truth or those who maintain that he lived in humiliation and suppression, deprived of his free will and choice, forced to observe double-standards and conceal the truth till the end? And despite knowing the implications of the following verse, he assimilated with the three Khulafā' and the forces of falsehood, thereby obscuring the truth and concealing the truth despite being the flag-bearer of the cause of truth himself.

The Nikāḥ of Umm Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا

The third issue in his letter pertains to the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, who is the biological daughter of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Consequently, he states that she was married to Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whilst this response is correct, it is completely evading the actual objective of the questioner. The questioner actually wishes to verify if Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had been married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or not, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī steers clearly away from the issue. Perhaps he did not realise the actual objective. Either way his shrewdness has been exposed.

One wonders how ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have forgotten his previous trick when responding to this question or did he find it convenient to do so. Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would have to question him about his reason for severing the ties of kinship of her maternal aunts from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and depriving her of this benefit. Is she not one of the Ahl al-Bayt, equally entitled to such a privilege? But I would take the liberty of answering on behalf of ʿAmmār ʿAlī ṣāḥib by saying that he considered the rule of "The seniors are more entitled to privileges". Since this is an established rule, why should it be opposed?

ʿAmmār ʿAlī thought that perhaps his critics would think that the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, daughter of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a unique issue and it has no resemblance to the marriages of Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, he concealed the reality fearing that someone may draw resemblances from these two instances but let me make it known that both instances are equal according to the Ahl al-Sunnah and there is no difference at all.

Now ʿAmmār ʿAlī should rectify his previous statement and write to Mīr Nādir ʿAlī informing him that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not the biological daughter of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, and he should not fear any reproach from the Ahl al-Sunnah because the option of Badā' is always there for such errors. After all, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is certainly not greater than Allah than he cannot be a victim of the accursed Badā'. If despite his all-encompassing knowledge Allah Taʿālā has instances of Badā' then ʿAmmār ʿAlī is human after all.

Nevertheless, it would have been wiser to say that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is the biological daughter of Asmā' bint ʿUmays رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا instead. If this is a blatant lie, then

who cares? After all the relationship of the Prophet ﷺ with his daughters was rejected, so what if his granddaughter's ties of kinship are denied as well. When people speak so many lies for worldly gain what harm could there be in speaking a lie or two for the preservation of one's dīn. Instead, lying in this case could be a tremendous virtue as it preserves the dīn and affords one the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of one's seniors and illustrious Imāms who lied freely under the pretext of Taqiyyah.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's deception

Let us elaborate further on the response given by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Whilst he has benefitted from his shrewd response, he has sustained some harm too. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says the following:

وَلَا تَلْبِسُوا الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُوْا الْحَقَّ وَاَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ

And do not mix the truth with falsehood or conceal the truth while you know [it].[1]

وَلَا تَكْتُمُوا الشَّهَادَةَ وَمَن يَّكْتُمْهَا فَإِنَّهُ أٰثِمٌ قَلْبُهُ

And do not conceal testimony, for whoever conceals it, his heart is indeed sinful.[2]

Ponder over these two verses carefully, but before clarifying its implication I must make it known that I err in doing so because what tremendous effort has ʿAmmār ʿAlī not spared in portraying falsehood as truth and concealing the truth that he would now be deterred from doing so by these two verses. Could there be a greater misrepresentation of the truth than failing to mention the marriage of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to Umm Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا? If he were to have refuted Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا relationship with Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then it would not be classified as misrepresentation of the truth. Instead it would be rejection of the truth which is termed as Juḥūd in the Qur'ān and the following verse will be applicable:

وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِأٰيَاتِنَا إِلَّا كُلُّ خَتَّارٍ كَفُوْرٍ

And none rejects Our signs except everyone treacherous and ungrateful.[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 42.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 283.

3 Sūrah Luqmān: 32.

As for the manner in which ʿAmmār ʿAlī responded, he has adopted the path which satisfies the listener without endangering his position. Similarly, he is not really at fault for this because misrepresentation is only evil if it deceives someone and this is not so because the Ahl al-Sunnah have accessed those Shīʿī reports which establish that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was indeed married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If you are not convinced, then here are the reports for your inspection.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ performed her nikāḥ

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, al-Shahīd al-Rabīʿ, states the following whilst writing about ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the uncle of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

> The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was very fond of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he would say that Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is in the place of his father.

He then goes on recording many merits of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and says:

> ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ presented ʿUmar's proposal to ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ rejected it at first. He proposed for the second time on behalf of ʿUmar and this time ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ remained silent. ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then performed Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ and she was married to ʿUmar. However, on account of Taqiyyah ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ could not prevent this from happening, so he remained silent.

This is what the Qāḍī states in his book.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will be among those who will be on the Aʿrāf according to the Shīʿah

I have referred to ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with honour by adding *Radī Allāh ʿanhu* to his name but this does not occur in the actual text. Would the Shīʿah even honour him? Whilst their enmity for ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is known and their affiliation with the Ahl al-Bayt is repeatedly proclaimed, they actually maintain that ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be on the Aʿrāf on the Day of Resurrection. Their claims are hollow since everyone knows that one who was so dear to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could never be detained on the Aʿrāf. In fact, the possibility of those who merely love him entering paradise is not far-fetched. Whilst this is their belief regarding the esteemed uncle of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they believe that those who love ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and those whom he loves cannot be adversely affected by their sins, not even by being guilty of kufr.

The beloved of the Prophet ﷺ in Aʿrāf whilst Jews and Christians in Paradise?

Consequently, the Shīʿah scholar Raḍī al-Dīn declares the Christian, Zunaynā ibn Isḥāq to be an inmate of Paradise on account of a few couplets she recited in praise of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, even though the very same couplets attest to him being a Christian. The couplets are:

عدي وتيم لا أحاول ذكرهم — بسوء ولكني محب لهاشم
وما يعتريني في علي وأهله — إذا ذكروا في الله لومة لائم
يقولون ما بال النصاري لحبهم — وأهل النبي من اعرب واعاجم
فقلت لهم إني لأحسب حبهم — سرى في قلوب الخلق حتى البهائم

I do not make efforts to adversely mention the tribes of ʿAdī and Taym,
however, I am a lover of the Hāshim tribe;
when ʿAlī and his family are mentioned I am not,
taken over by any sentiment of apprehension for the next;
they ask why is it the Christians love him,
as well as the Prophet's followers both Arab and non-Arab;
I say to them, I believe the love for them,
has penetrated the hearts of all creation, even the animals.

Similarly, all the scholars of the Shīʿah have high regards for Ibn Faḍlūn, who was a Jew, on account of the following couplets:

رب هب لي من المعيشة سؤلي — واعف عني بحق آل الرسول
واسقني شربة بكــف علي — سيد الأولياء بــعل بــتول

O Lord grant me the prayers of my life,
and forgive me by virtue of the family of the Prophet;
and give me to drink from the hands of ʿAlī,
the leader of the pious, the husband of Fāṭimah.

Nevertheless, what can be said about the rank of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; those who love him are entitled to Paradise despite their disbelief whilst the one whom the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ loved will be restrained from entering Paradise and held back on Aʿrāf. His beloved in this instance is none other than his own uncle who was a great believer. If he had been a disbeliever, he would not even have reached Aʿrāf, since the Qur'ān says the following about the disbelievers:

إِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِيْنَ سَلَاسِلَ وَأَغْلَالًا وَّسَعِيْرًا

Indeed, We have prepared for the disbelievers chains and shackles and a blaze.[1]

وَالَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا لَهُمْ نَارُ جَهَنَّمَ لَا يُقْضٰى عَلَيْهِمْ فَيَمُوْتُوْا وَلَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمْ مِّنْ عَذَابِهَا ۚ كَذٰلِكَ نَجْزِيْ كُلَّ كَفُوْرٍ

And for those who disbelieve will be the fire of Hell. [Death] is not decreed for them so they may die, nor will its torment be lightened for them. Thus do we recompense every ungrateful one.[2]

Nevertheless, we should assess the claim of the learned Qāḍī: What did he claim and what does he actually establish through this claim? Surprisingly, his claim establishes that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also regarded ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be in the position of a father. Assuming that he was not willing to accept the proposal, ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not one who could be ignored. Therefore, he knew that it was best to honour him and accept the request. His silence was surely not on account of Taqiyyah.

ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ silence reflects his approval

We have established that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was certainly married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As for the allegation of Taqiyyah, any sensible person knows that this is merely the imagination of the Shīʿah. The narration itself discredits the possibility of Taqiyyah. Every Muslim knows that Taqiyyah has no relationship with ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ character at all. Would a lion ever fear a jackal? Would it ever be possible to conceive that he resorted to Taqiyyah in an issue as sensitive as this? Even a disbeliever who is immoral and unworthy by all standards would not tolerate such

1 Sūrah al-Dahr: 4.

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 36.

an episode. Similarly, it is impossible to imagine the beloved of the Prophet ﷺ committing such a heinous crime against the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Similarly, the Prophet's ﷺ love for anyone determines that he is accepted and he is upon truth. So, when the beloved of the Prophet ﷺ is upon truth would he ever commit the crime of handing the honourable granddaughter over to an enemy?

If we were to assume that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه approved of her marriage to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه on account of Taqiyyah then the crime that he is guilty of (by giving his daughter to an enemy) is more disgusting than the Taqiyyah itself. O Shīʿah! If it is ʿUmar رضي الله عنه that you hate, then why do you vilify ʿAlī رضي الله عنه along with ʿUmar رضي الله عنه?

If ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is a kāfir then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is no less

It should be noted that if ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is a Muslim of perfect faith then the same applies to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, because ʿAlī رضي الله عنه gave his daughter to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. However, if ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is a disbeliever, then the same applies to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, and if he not a disbeliever, then certainly a blatant transgressor for marrying his daughter to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه (who was a disbeliever according to the Shīʿah). If he gave her in marriage by his own choice then there is no doubt about his kufr but if he was compelled then despite his capabilities, did he not even have the dignity and self-respect which even a lowly cobbler has?

O my Rabb; you are aware that I am in complete disagreement with such beliefs and I have written these lines about the marriage of the daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها so that ʿAmmār ʿAlī may not harbour evil thoughts about ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

This marriage is established from Shīʿī sources

We now undertake to prove Qāḍī Nūr Allāh wrong from the testimony of his very own Imāmī. Accordingly, the Shīʿī sources contain reports which state that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had indeed married Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as he was worthy and deserving of this honour. He did not do so under duress. Read the following:

> سئل الإمام محمد بن على الباقر عن تزويجها فقال: لولا إنه رآه أهلا لما كان يزوجها إياه ، وكانت اشرف نساء العالمين ، جدّها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ، وأخواها الحسن والحسين – سيدا شباب اهل الجنة ، وأبوها

علي – ذو الشرف والمنقبة في الإسلام ، وأمّها فاطمة بنت محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ، وجدتها خديجة بنت خويلد رضي الله عنها

Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ was asked about the reason for marrying her to him [ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ]. He said that if ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ felt that ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not worthy and deserving of her then he would have never approved of the marriage. She was the most honourable woman in the world at that time. Her grandfather was the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; her brothers were Ḥasan رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the leaders of the youth of Paradise, her father was ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ who has a prestigious position in Islam; her mother was Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا, daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and her grandmother was Khadījah bint Khuwaylid رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

The Shīʿah do not love the Ahl al-Bayt and they hate the Ṣaḥābah

Consider the above narration against the allegations of their Qāḍī. How deceitful and cunning are they. They claim that their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah is on account of their love for the Ahl al-Bayt. We feel that the actual reality is that they align themselves to the Ahl al-Bayt due to their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah. However, the Ahl al-Bayt do not seem to be drawn to them. Instead, they are inclining to this course, i.e. the path of the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is established from the words of Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ and Taqiyyah was completely forbidden for him, as has been recorded previously with a quotation from their sources.

After he has set the record straight would they persist upon defaming ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥasan رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the Banū Hāshim by asserting that they were immoral and shameless and that they subjected the innocent and pure granddaughter of the Prophet to *zinā* (fornication) despite her being exalted in the following verse:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا

Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.[1]

May Allah take such wretched ones to task! The Ahl al-Bayt are certainly incensed and angry with them, even those with weak īmān shudder at such blasphemy. How

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

daring are they that they portray their vice as virtue and slander their Imāms. They place the blame of their sins upon Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ and slander him and they use such words to absolve themselves of blame for this marriage that one fears to utter it. They say:

وهو أول فرج غصب منا

This was the first woman to be abducted from us.

(Note: This is not the literal translation of these vile words but a subtle indication of its shameful purport- translator)

O Allah! You are aware that I disassociate myself from entertaining such beliefs and I record these words with the understanding that reporting a statement of kufr does not render one a kāfir. Perhaps one who has been deceived by the Shīʿah may consider their wicked statements and return to the Straight Path.

If love of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ entitles one to Paradise then why not ties of kinship

It is tragic that the Ahl al-Bayt suffered such misfortune on account of the Shīʿah hatred for ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ but ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not be forgiven and blessed by virtue of the sanctity of the Ahl al-Bayt (with whom he was intimately associated with). Is his association of marriage less than the worth of the couplets of Zunaynā ibn Isḥāq—the Christian—and Ibn Faḍlūn—the Jew? Love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ is so potent that kufr can be disregarded despite the Qur'ān stating that hell is the abode of the disbelievers. Can love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ then not secure the forgiveness of those related to him?

Nevertheless, the Shīʿī scholars are unanimous about the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا to ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, some ignorant ones state the truth, but their manner of expression is gross and uncouth (referring to the Arabic quotation recorded above). Moreover, we are bound to take what is correct and disregard that which is reprehensive on the basis of:

خذ ما صفا ودع ما كدر

Take what is pure and discard what is tainted.

As far as ʿAmmār ʿAlī is concerned, he has surpassed them all. He realised that expressing the truth about this marriage would jeopardise the entire Shīʿī faith.

Not only that, it would demand that the Shīʿah revere ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a thousand times more than what the Ahl al-Sunnah revere him because he would then be a member of the Ahl al-Bayt.

And in the case of Taqiyyah, despite it being a false allegation, the same problem arises. In fact, it is worse in this instance because accepting the wrongs of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on account of the Ahl al-Bayt is lesser than not listening to the Ahl al-Bayt on account of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ having to be one of them.

And it was on account of this accusation of Taqiyyah that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was accused of being absolutely shameless, undignified, cowardly and weak in religious matters. Therefore, I feel that ʿAmmār ʿAlī was wise and he felt that since falsehood is itself bad, rather just avoid the truth as well.

On the whole this response reflects cleverness and perhaps we should take the opportunity of stating the reality so that if not all at once, perhaps it will gradually appeal to him.

It is also necessary for us to record additional narrations for two benefits. Firstly, it would decrease his rage and hatred for ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and secondly, the fact that there are multiple narrations about this, would force him to be ashamed of himself and surrender, albeit reluctantly.

The narration is as follows:

> روا إبن ابي الحديد شارح نهج البلاغة في قصة تزويج أم كلثوم ، فجاء عمر إلى مجلس المهاجرين بالروضة وقال : رفّؤني رفّؤني ، قالوا : بما ذا يا امير المؤمنين؟ قال : تزوجت أمّ كلثوم ن بنت علي بن ابي طالب
>
> Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd—the commentator of *Nahj al-Balāghah*—records the following regarding the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا: ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to a group of the Muhājirīn who were seated in the Rawḍah and said to them: "Congratulate me! Congratulate me!"
>
> When they asked him why, he informed them that he had contracted a marriage with Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the daughter of ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

This narration indicates that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ considered this marriage to be a great blessing. This narration is sufficient for those who are impartial, to make them

have great regard for ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is because he was celebrating his association with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ through this union. As for those who cannot understand this, we are not compelled to shove it down their throats.

ʿUmar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ children from this union

Before terminating this discussion, it is important to highlight a fact just in case any Shīʿah decides to save face by stating that ʿUmar had not consummated this marriage to Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا due to the intervention of a Jinn similar to the incident relating to Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the wife of Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. So even though this is established to be a lie on the basis of the unrealistic report attributed to Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, it is nonetheless established through Tawātur that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا bore a son from this union, whose name was Zayd. This child lived till the age of twenty and was then martyred in one of the internal feuds of the Banū ʿAdī. *To Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return.* His mother passed away on the same day after succumbing to an illness. Nine people passed away on that dreadful day and the funeral prayers and burial proceedings were offered by Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا remained married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ till the end of his life. Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا cannot boast of being the granddaughter of someone as prestigious as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, so when she was saved in an instant, Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا ought to have been released from this marriage even quicker than that.

The Discussion Relating to the Fadak Estate

All praises belong to Allah, we have responded adequately to all the allegations of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. However, in response to his allegations and accusations regarding the Fadak Estate, we ought to have retaliated *tit for tat*, but it is not appropriate for us to stoop to such levels and utter that which intelligent and noble people would consider offensive or shameful.

Firstly, taking ʿAmmār ʿAlī to task for vilifying the three Khulafā' is akin to somebody resolving to slap a dog for spitting at the sun or punishing someone who spits at the sun/moon by pouring urine on them. It is evident that the sun or moon is unaffected by such worthless gestures. Instead, such foolish antics only laud the lofty status of the sun or the moon, as filth and abuse cannot taint it. Secondly, whilst the sun and the moon remain in its splendour, dogs and those who stoop lower than that can only be condemned to their fate because they feel no shame upon their despicability, and besides wasting time and effort, they achieve nothing from their endeavours.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's vilification of the three Khulafā' can be compared to the above example; his filthy utterances only serve to establish the lofty status of the three Khulafā'. The three Khulafā' are radiant like the sun and the moon, and if dogs spit at them then what else could be expected from the dog? Secondly, like the dog has no relation to the radiant sun, ʿAmmār ʿAlī enjoys no status in relation to the three Khulafā' whereby we could feel a sense of relief in retaliating for his vilification of them. The worst of his insults cannot tarnish their image in the least and devoting time to express disassociation to the three Khulafā' and vilifying them is just a waste of time.

Lastly, responding to a fool magnifies his importance and we certainly do not wish to accord him such attention.

Love of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah

Love for the Ahl al-Bayt is at the very core of our faith and we maintain that love for them and the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ are the two wings with which we soar and transcend. Just as it is impossible for a bird to take flight with one wing only, so too is it impossible for īmān to be the means for achieving the ultimate success referred to in the following two verses:

وَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْفَائِزُوْنَ

And it is those who are the attainers [of success].[1]

فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيْمًا

Has certainly attained a great attainment.[2]

In fact, īmān without these two wings would be like the īmān referred to in the following verse:

لَا يَنْفَعُ نَفْسًا إِيْمَانُهَا

No soul will benefit from its faith.[3]

Yes, if we were to follow in the footsteps of the Shīʿah, who disparage the Ṣaḥābah in order to spite the Ahl al-Sunnah, according to the idiom, *cutting one's nose to avoid the effect of the evil eye*, thus destroying their īmān, then, Allah forbid, we ought to have vilified the Ahl al-Bayt to spite them and render our īmān invalid as the Khawārij and Nawāṣib have done. However, it would be impossible for us to do so as we are governed by intelligence and that which has been divinely transmitted to us (*ʿaql* and *naql*). As for the Shīʿah, they have no limits and restrictions, like a stray camel wandering about aimlessly.

The two eyes of īmān

The reality is that both groups, the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt, enjoy the greatest significance and importance to us and they are like two eyes for us. If we destroy any one of our eyes, it would be to our detriment only. Imagine a person who has a beautiful face and features; if one of his eyes were to be disfigured, it would make the other eye also unattractive. Similarly, if the pupil from the defective eye were to be inserted into the good eye and the white area within the normal eye were now filled with blackness, it would be so odious and dreadful that anyone who may have had any attraction to this person would cringe at the mere sight of him. The person himself would be so disturbed by this reaction that he would desire that the defective eye remain as it is without its contents being implanted into the normal eye.

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 20.

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 71.

3 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 158.

As absurd as this is, this seems to be the reality of the īmān of the Shīʿah. Nevertheless, reverence for the Ṣaḥābah and love for the Ahl al-Bayt are like the two eyes of īmān according to the testimony of the Qur'ān and ḥadīth (and which the reader of this book has already witnessed). As for the Shīʿah, they have disfigured one eye completely and they have placed this eye and its contents into the socket of the correct eye.

The correlation is as follows: The Shīʿah have disregarded reverence and love for the Ṣaḥābah, which is the fountainhead of īmān and they have exaggerated the veneration for the Ahl al-Bayt so much that they have dedicated the portion of reverence for the Ṣaḥābah to the Ahl al-Bayt. They did not stop at this but just as in the example, the entire portion of the whiteness was replaced with blackness only, the Shīʿah have done exactly the same.

Consequently, just as the eye comprises of a pupil and the whiteness around it, the word ʿ*Itrah*—which refers to the Ahl al-Bayt—refers to a few categories of relatives such as wives, offspring and kith and kin. This meaning of ʿ*itrah* is unanimously agreed upon by linguists. Now consider that from the entire implication of this term, the Shīʿah merely revere twelve individuals and a few others and reject the rest. Since they declare these twelve to be their leaders, they venerate them only and assign the portion of reverence and veneration due to the rest of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah to these twelve particular individuals. This explains the relation to the example cited above; whilst the normal eye has become enlarged, the whiteness has been substituted with blackness.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to elaborate and substantiate this point, lest the Shīʿah consider it an allegation and misrepresentation of the facts. They could actually consider it an allegation due to saying: "A man judges other by his own standards." They are then at liberty to verify this from their references and their scholars, and they would be left with no alternative other than attesting to the truth of what has been written here.

Honouring some of the Ahl al-Bayt and rejecting the rest

Consequently, the Shīʿah do not even consider Sayyidah Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا to be the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This view is so commonly heard from the Shīʿah that along with the masses, the learned

among them also claim this. The error of the learned ones is worse since authentic Shīʿī sources establish that they were indeed the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ and this has been documented earlier on.

Similarly, the Shīʿah do not include the honourable uncle of the Prophet ﷺ, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, or his family to be among the ʿitrah of the Prophet ﷺ. The same applies to Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām رضي الله عنه. Whilst Sayyidunā ʿAbbās enjoys a very prominent relationship and link with the Prophet ﷺ not many are aware of the close ties which Sayyidunā Zubayr رضي الله عنه enjoys. In fact, he could actually be considered a brother to the Prophet ﷺ on account of his close links and ties. Firstly, Sayyidunā Zubayr's رضي الله عنه mother is Ṣafiyyah رضي الله عنها who is the paternal aunt of the Prophet ﷺ. His paternal grandmother is Hālah bint Wahb ibn ʿAbd al-Manāf, who is the true maternal aunt of the Prophet ﷺ (his mother's sister). His father's paternal aunt is Umm Ḥabīb bint al-Asad, who is the Prophet's ﷺ paternal grandmother and his paternal aunt is Sayyidah Khadījah رضي الله عنها, who is the Prophet's ﷺ wife. In addition to this, his wife is Sayyidah Asmā', who is none other than the sister of Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها, the wife of the Prophet ﷺ. Finally, his ancestry links up with the Prophet ﷺ at the fifth ancestor, Quṣay ibn Kilāb. Based on this, the scholars of ancestral lineage have written that no other Ṣaḥābī enjoyed closer blood ties with the Prophet ﷺ than Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām رضي الله عنه.

Notwithstanding such close ties, the manner in which the Shīʿah conduct themselves makes apparent the enmity they truly harbour for the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Despite Sayyidunā Zubayr رضي الله عنه being one of the earliest Muslims and earliest emigrants, whose praise has been mentioned Noble Qur'ān repeatedly, the Shīʿah consider him to be among the disbelievers and hypocrites.

Who is meant by the term Ahl al-Bayt?

As for their vilification and hatred for the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ—the Mothers of the Believers—it requires no elaboration. Such perceptions about the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ is all the more repugnant considering that they are the actual and primary implication of the term "Ahl al-Bayt". What else would Ahl al-Bayt mean other than the household of the Prophet ﷺ or the members of his house? Even if he knows nothing else, ʿAmmār ʿAlī would certainly know that this is what Ahl al-Bayt implies.

Secondly, when this term appears in the Noble Qur'ān it appears in relation to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ. As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, they are included by the broader connotation of the term Ahl al-Bayt, or they were included by the personal request of the Prophet ﷺ. For your satisfaction, the verse wherein this term appears will be quoted along with the context in which it appears so that both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah will have no further misconceptions about this term. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ لَسْتُنَّ كَأَحَدٍ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ إِنِ اتَّقَيْتُنَّ فَلَا تَخْضَعْنَ بِالْقَوْلِ فَيَطْمَعَ الَّذِي فِي قَلْبِهِ مَرَضٌ وَقُلْنَ قَوْلًا مَعْرُوفًا وَقَرْنَ فِي بُيُوتِكُنَّ وَلَا تَبَرَّجْنَ تَبَرُّجَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ الْأُولَى وَأَقِمْنَ الصَّلَاةَ وَآتِينَ الزَّكَاةَ وَأَطِعْنَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا (٣٣) وَاذْكُرْنَ مَا يُتْلَى فِي بُيُوتِكُنَّ مِنْ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَالْحِكْمَةِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ لَطِيفًا خَبِيرًا

O wives of the Prophet, you are not like anyone among women. If you fear Allah, then do not be soft in speech [to men], lest he in whose heart is disease should covet, but speak with appropriate speech. And abide in your houses and do not display yourselves as [was] the display of the former times of ignorance. And establish prayer and give zakāh and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification. And remember what is recited in your houses of the verses of Allah and wisdom. Indeed, Allah is ever Subtle and Acquainted [with all things].[1]

This is the correct translation of these verses in its context. Any Shīʿī is at liberty to refer to his scholars about the correctness of this translation. Nevertheless, the verses establish that the noble consorts of the Prophet ﷺ are the primary implication of the term "Ahl al-Bayt".

Placing the cloak around Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ gathered Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidah Fāṭimah, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, placed his sheet around them and supplicated thus:

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 32-34.

"O Allah, these are the members of my household." The purpose of this was to include them in the merit announced in this verse of the Noble Qur'ān.

The above is similar to the manner in which a magnanimous and appreciative king tells his minister: "I am going to allot land for the members of your household." The minister realises that this naturally includes him, his wife and sons and that it does not refer to daughters or granddaughters, as they live their own lives and are under the authority of their husbands. However, seeing the opportunity; he requests the king to confer the bounty on his daughter and son-in-law too. Now, if the king were to enquire who these people are, then considering the fact that the son-in-law and the daughter are no less in relationship to him than his own wives, he will say: "These are members of my family too." Now despite the king knowing that his son-in-law and daughter are not members of his own house, he overlooks this and allots land for them too.

Alternatively, it could be said that despite being revealed in relation to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ only, the term "Ahl al-Bayt" collectively refers to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ as well as Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and his household.

This is similar to the use of the Urdu term "Delhi wālā"—which means one who lives in Delhi —it refers equally to all those who reside in Delhi. Now, if someone sees two people from Delhi and say, "These are Delhi wālā", then even the most ignorant person will not conclude that these two people are the sole residents of Delhi.

It is clear from this explanation that the Qur'ānic reference to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ as Ahl al-Bayt and the ḥadīth reference to the household of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه by the same term is perfectly in order.

Nevertheless, despite the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ being the actual Ahl al-Bayt and the Qur'ān being revealed to establish this along with asserting that:

وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ

And his wives are [in the position of] their mothers.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 6.

The Shīʿah still do not refrain from hurling abuse and vilifying them. However, if in response to the verse, *His wives are [in the position of] their mothers*, they were to reply: "They are mothers unto the believers, not unto us", then we would accept that from them, but what would their response be to the verse which classifies them as the Ahl –Bayt?

By their rejection of their status as Ahl al-Bayt the reader can gauge the sentiment which this sect has for the illustrious wives of the Prophet ﷺ.

Shīʿah have enmity for most of the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها

Despite their claims of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, the Shīʿah bear intense hatred for most of the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, criticising and vilifying them. Amongst them is Zayd رحمه الله—the martyr—who is the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رضي الله عنه. He was exceptionally learned, Allah fearing, and pious. He was martyred by the forces of Hishām ibn ʿAbd al-Malik.

As for his son, Yaḥyā ibn Zayd, he is branded as apostate by the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. The same applies to Ibrāhīm and Jaʿfar, the two sons of Mūsa al-Kāẓim. As far as Jaʿfar, the Shīʿah have given him the title "The Great Liar" despite him being a pious saint and friend of Allah. Jaʿfar ibn Mūsa al-Kāẓim is the spiritual mentor or shaykh of Bāyazīd al-Busṭāmī رحمه الله.

As for Jaʿfar ibn ʿAlī, the brother of Imām Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Shīʿah also refer to him as "the Great Liar". As for Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan al-Muthannā, his son—ʿAbd Allāh al-Mahḍ—and his son Muḥammad, Dhū al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah (the purified soul); they are considered to be disbelievers according to the Shīʿah. They also regard Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Zakariyyā ibn Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Ḥasan, Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan and Yaḥyā ibn ʿUmar (the grandson of Zayd the martyr) all to be disbelievers and apostate. In addition to this, they consider numerous members of the Ahl al-Bayt from the lineage of both Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما to be deviates for recognising the status and merits of Zayd رحمه الله—the martyr. A brief look at the books of History and Ancestry would prove that almost all of the Ahl al-Bayt members explicitly attested to the exalted position of Zayd رحمه الله.

The summary of this entire discussion is that they consider all the above individuals to be disbelievers and renegades, and they maintain that despite being from the

progeny of the most honoured and beloved daughter of the Prophet ﷺ they are destined for the Fire of Jahannam for eternity. This is based on their view that whoever rejects the status of one of their Imāms is a disbeliever of the same category as one who has rejected the Nubuwwah of any Prophet. Since this is the case, the position of the disbelievers is clear; they will abide in hell forever. This implies that all these illustrious members of the Ahl al-Bayt are doomed to hell forever and they will never attain salvation. Allah forbid!

(To spare themselves from the implications of this allegation) Some do say that these illustrious people will be restrained at Aʿrāf like Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, the venerable uncle of the Prophet ﷺ. Others among them maintain that they will gain deliverance from the Fire after being subjected to the most painful torment, through the intercession of their illustrious ancestors.

However, both interpretations lack substance since according to them rejecting the doctrine of Imāmah is an act of disbelief and there is no possibility of interceding for a disbeliever or him being restrained at Aʿrāf. It is unanimously agreed upon that there would be no intercession for a disbeliever and that such intercession could never be accepted. Similarly, maintaining that the disbelievers would be restrained at Aʿrāf also conflicts with the Noble Qur'ān. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا وَمَاتُوْا وَهُمْ كُفَّارٌ أُولَئِكَ عَلَيْهِمْ لَعْنَةُ اللّٰهِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالنَّاسِ أَجْمَعِيْنَ خَالِدِيْنَ فِيْهَا لَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمُ الْعَذَابُ وَلَا هُمْ يُنْظَرُوْنَ

Indeed, those who disbelieve and die while they are disbelievers - upon them will be the curse of Allah and of the angels and the people, all together, Abiding eternally therein. The punishment will not be lightened for them, nor will they be reprieved.[1]

Therefore, whilst the claim of love is so deafening, this is the reality of their relationship with the offspring and progeny of the Prophet ﷺ, his noble wives, the progeny of their Imāms and brothers of their Imāms. Consequently, there is no difference between them and the Nawāṣib. If there is any then it is the same as the difference between ten and twelve. This is because the Shīʿah maintain the status of their twelve Imāms and some of their close relatives whilst the Nawāṣib do not.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 161.

However, their admiration and veneration of these personalities is also just a farce, since they criticise their very own Imāms and pronounce these faults openly to one and all. Some of this has already been recorded in this treatise.

The Shīʿah love for ʿAlī is worse than hatred for him

Whilst this is an appropriate juncture to elaborate on this, it is beyond the scope of this short treatise. However, I would record a few matters by way of example.

The Shīʿah have documented such fallacies regarding Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that, Allah forbid, it depicts him as a person who was extremely immoral and a great liar. Consequently, he gave his daughter in marriage to a kāfir and for fear of his life refrained from contesting the khilāfah and drumming up support for the position which he was most eligible to. Instead, he performed ṣalāh behind those 'disbelievers' and maintained amicable ties with them for as long as they lived. When they passed away, he continued to praise them with such lofty words, a tenth of which he has not proclaimed in favour of the 'actual' believers. When this is their view about Sayyidunā ʿAlī—the father of their Imāms—then what could be expected about the rest of them? While the Khawārij and Nawāṣib revile Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they too do not stoop to this level.

Similarly, their claim of love has another extreme as they belittle the status of all the Ambiyā' of Allah and raise the position of their Imāms. Consequently, the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah maintain that each one of the Twelve Imāms is superior to the all Ambiyā' of Allah.

However, the Noble Qur'ān repeatedly uses the terms *Iṣṭifā* and *Ijtibā* with reference to the Ambiyā' of Allah. This means that they have been selected as the best individuals of the human race and others cannot equal them. Similarly, the list of the four favoured groups in the Qur'ān commences with the Ambiyā' of Allah. This also implies that they are superior to the remaining three groups. Since it is evident that the Twelve Imāms were not Ambiyā', the Shīʿah could have placed them in any of the remaining three groups. It could have been said that they were from the category of "Ṣiddīqīn"—which is our belief as well—which would place them below the Ambiyā'.

The superiority of the Ambiyā' over the Imāms from Shīʿī references

However, it would be foolish for us to think that the Shīʿah would accept the word of Allah. Let us instead prove them wrong using their own references so that they are compelled to confess to the truth. Shīʿī scholars have laboured at length to fabricate reports about the superiority of the Imāms but the truth will always come to the fore. Consider the following report:

> روى الكليني عن هشام الأحول عن زيد بن علي: أن الأنبياء أفضل من الأئمة ، وأن من قال غير ذلك فهو ضالٌّ

> Al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of Hishām al-Aḥwal that Zayd ibn ʿAlī said that the Ambiyā' are superior to the Imāms and whoever believes otherwise is a deviate.

Similarly, Ibn Bābuwayh documents a lengthy narration with an authentic transmission (according to the Shīʿah) in his *Kitāb al-Amālī* pertaining to the marriage of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا. It contains the following:

> عن الصادق عن آبائه عليه السلام : إن الله تعالى قال لسكّان الجنة من الملائكة وأرواح الرسل ومن فيها: ألا ، إني زوّجت أحبّ النساء إليّ من أحبّ الرجال إليّ بعد النبيين

> Imām Jaʿfar relates from his forefathers that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى proclaimed to all the inmates of Paradise including the angels, the souls of the Prophets and whoever else was therein: "I have given the dearest female to me in marriage to the dearest man to me after the Ambiyā'."

It is astounding that the Shīʿah maintain the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā' whereas these narrations clearly establish the rank of Sayyidunā ʿAlī below the rank of the Ambiyā'.

The only apparent reason for this is that they have allotted the share of love for the Ṣaḥābah as well as the share of allegiance due to most of the Ahl al-Bayt to a few individuals only. Since the love of these twelve odd personalities has been so compounded and multiplied, it has exceeded all limits. In doing so, the Shīʿah have fallen prey to the error of the Christians; they exalted the status of ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to the extent of divinity.

This entire example fits perfectly with the description of the inappropriately proportioned one-eye given previously. Reflect again on a person who has a beautiful structure and form but one of his eyes have become disfigured. The defective socket and its contents are then placed where the correct eye is, enlarging it and to twice its size, filling the vacuum with blackness. In the same way, the Shīʿah have maintained love for the Ahl al-Bayt and have disassociated themselves from the Ṣaḥābah; and whilst they may maintain the love of the Ahl al-Bayt, they have blown it out of proportion. Similarly, they have selected a few of the Ahl al-Bayt and branded the rest as deviates and disbelievers. The allegiance that was due to all of them has been compounded and directed to a few personalities.

It is evident that just as an eye with such a description is most repugnant and unattractive, when one of the two, i.e. love for the Ahl-al-Bayt and veneration for the Ṣaḥābah—which are like the two eyes of īmān—exist without the other, then such īmān is also void of any attraction.

Therefore, we are certain that even the Twelve Imāms disapprove of such love and admiration. They would also wish that love for them be in due proportion so that it does not seem unsightly. Similarly, they would want the love for the Ṣaḥābah to be restored because the defect of one eye impinges on the beauty of the other eye. Thus, the beauty of Islam and īmān can only be realised by maintaining both aspects.

Rejecting the testimony of Allah and their Imāms regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Since the Ahl al-Sunnah consider securing the pleasure of the Ahl al-Bayt their greatest fortune, this humble servant of the Ahl al-Bayt conveys this message on their behalf to all the Shīʿah in general and to ʿAmmār ʿAlī in particular, that your extreme expression of love for the Ahl al-Bayt is unacceptable unless it is accompanied with equal admiration and veneration for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Admiration and love is particularly due to his Companion of the Cave—Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq—from all the Ṣaḥābah, who was the one who was given the title of a being a Ṣaḥābī by Allah himself, and this verse was discussed at length earlier. Similarly, the Imāms have testified to his exalted position of being al-Ṣiddīq and they have showered praise on him liberally. When this is the position he enjoys then vilifying him is nothing less than falsifying Allah and the Imāms. In order to

avert such an eventuality, one would have to overlook every fault and flaw of his—if any—and one would have to acknowledge that such flaws and faults are on account of one's own short-sightedness. It is impossible for Allah and the Imāms to be in error!

Instead, we ought to believe that what appears to be flaws are actually merits even though we do not comprehend it. We ought to accept that there is every possibility of lack of comprehension, intelligence, and wisdom on our part and there is nothing strange about this. Did not Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, despite being endowed with the light of Prophethood and possessing perfect intelligence, not misunderstand Khiḍr's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ actions? Did he not consider it oppressive when he damaged the ship and took the life of a young boy whereas these actions were perfectly in order and carried out by the approval of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى? Is it not strange that he objected to Khiḍr even after being directed by Allah to accompany Khiḍr and after he was made aware of the position of Khiḍr? This entire episode appears in Sūrah al-Kahaf.

Nevertheless, when a Prophet as exalted as Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ—who features prominently among the great Messengers and whose mention the Qur'ān is replete with—could not appreciate the reality of Khiḍr's actions, who was not a prophet of Allah according to the majority view and far lower in rank than Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, then the Shī'ah who are neither Ambiyā' of Allah nor *Awliyā'* (pious servants)—but instead are bereft of all intelligence and wisdom—should never feel worthy of objecting to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

It is not farfetched for them to take objection to some of the actions of the leader of the Awliyā' of the Ummah; instead this is what logic dictates since this Ummah is the best nation and its Awliyā' are most superior in rank. What can be said of he who secured praise from Allah and from the Imāms as well, he will most certainly be the best of all the Awliyā' without any doubt. Now, if the actions of one who is so exalted in stature cannot be understood even by the Imāms and is not appreciated then too it is inconsequential and irrelevant as his rank is so elevated.

Still the Shī'ah might insist that their Imāms enjoy the most superior position according to them and even if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is virtuous, he could never be better than them or their equal. Therefore, we would like them to first accept the testimony and tribute of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and their illustrious Imāms regarding the merits of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then we will reply to this Shī'ī chain of thought.

If we were to accept that the illustrious Imāms are superior to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then what would be the response to those verses—which have already been recorded—in which Allah has explicitly declared the Muhājirīn to be the best of this Ummah. Similarly, what would be the response to the verses which implicitly declare Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be the best of them all? If these verses are incorrect according to your wrong beliefs, then it is inconsequential because Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ also objected to Khiḍr because he could not understand the reality of his actions; he therefore considered kindness to be harshness and justice to be oppression.

The incident of Nabī Mūsa and Khiḍr—An eye-opener

Nevertheless, it is a demand of faith in Allah and respect for the illustrious Imāms that the Shīʿah mistrust their own intelligence and acknowledge the position of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ—due to the testimony of Allah and the tribute of the Imāms, which is recorded in the beginning and middle of this treatise—despite your belief of him being a heretic and non-believer. They ought to have kept the incident of Sayyidunā Mūsa and Khiḍr as an example so that their flawed intellect and warped understanding could be soothed by such a precursor. This incident has been recorded for moments such as these but the Shīʿah are bent on harbouring ill-feelings for the selected servants of Allah, thereby incurring the wrath of Allah. How knowledgeable and merciful is Allah for relating this incident but it is of no purpose to them. At the least, they should have submitted to the demands of faith in Allah and respect for the illustrious Imāms, but alas!

Even if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr erred it would be converted to a virtuous deed otherwise he would not have secured the tributes of the Imāms

If the above request was too difficult for them to accept and they are bent on finding fault with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then surely it is not difficult for them to understand that certain people's misdeeds would be converted to righteous deeds in the hereafter. This appears in the Qur'ān in the following verse:

إِلَّا مَنْ تَابَ وَآمَنَ وَعَمِلَ عَمَلًا صَالِحًا فَأُولَئِكَ يُبَدِّلُ اللَّهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ حَسَنَاتٍ

Except for those who repent, believe and do righteous work. For them Allah will replace their evil deeds with good.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Furqān: 70.

Some Shīʿah may have reservations about this and confine this conversion of sins to those mentioned specifically in the verses before this and which were committed in the period of disbelief. Therefore, they could say that if any of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's sins are converted to merits, it would only be those committed in the period before his reversion to Islam. As for those that were perpetrated later on, such as usurping the Fadak Estate which happened after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ, we see no reprieve for him.

The answer to this would be that only those could entertain such misgivings whose hearts are filled with doubt and bereft of conviction. Even if the conversion of sins refers specifically to those perpetrated in the period of disbelief it nonetheless establishes Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ capacity to convert sins into merits. Similarly, the sins of the era of disbelief are usually more in number and of a graver nature, and if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ would convert these to merits then the vices perpetrated in the period of Islam are far less and relatively lighter. What difficulty could there be in their conversion to merits? In addition to this, the person in question is one who has been praised by Allah and the illustrious Imāms, so doubting such a person's īmān and virtue can only be the task of one who doubts Allah and the illustrious Imāms. Therefore, when the īmān and rectitude of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is established by Allah and the Imāms then why would there be reluctance in accepting that his flaws would be converted to virtues?

Repentance from sins secures entry into Paradise

If they protest that the conversion of sins to virtues is conditional upon the person repenting and we are not certain that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ repented. Firstly, if conversion of sins is conditional then so be it, but if this is viewed against the praise showered upon him by Allah and the illustrious Imāms then this surely demands that his sin has been converted to a virtue even though he did not actually repent.

Secondly, if the conversion of sins is conditional then the testimony of Allah and the illustrious Imāms provides ample evidence that he had repented before his demise. If he did not repent, then he would be deserving of criticism and scorn, not praise and compliments.

But if the Shīʿah take objection and say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ praised him initially (and then too unknowingly) whereas these vices were perpetrated later on then

we must admit that the lord of the Shīʿah is such that he has no idea what would unfold in the future. As for our Lord, He possesses the knowledge of the unseen and all events are encompassed by His infinite knowledge of the infinite past and the perpetual future. Therefore, if according to their claim Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was evil, he would not have received praise from Allah. What need arose for Allah to make an incorrect statement and be embarrassed before the Shīʿah?

If they do not have faith in Allah then they should at least accept the word of the illustrious Imāms, who seem to enjoy a higher position than Allah according to them. As for Allah, He is a victim of their notorious dogma, Badā', whilst the Imāms are immune from this. In addition, the Imāms have all-encompassing knowledge of the past and future. Thus, the only valid explanation for their praise of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is that his vice has been converted to virtue.

Establishing his repentance from Shīʿī reports

If even this does not satisfy them then we have another response; Shīʿah reports attest that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ repented from the crime of usurping the Fadak Estate. Allah willing, we will produce this record shortly, which states that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr handed over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. It also states that she was pleased by this gesture. Well, if this is not considered to be repentance from an error then what does repentance mean?

One whose good deeds are weightier would enter paradise

If this also does not dispel the kufr from their hearts, then we have another response. The Shīʿah would agree that after reckoning takes place on the Day of Resurrection, those whose good deeds are weightier would be admitted to Paradise and those whose bad deeds are more would be destined to enter Hell.

Just in case they have a doubt about this fact, we present a Qur'ānic verse which happens to be from the last portion of the last *Juz* of the Qur'ān. This is so because whilst they have no knowledge of the Qur'ān, they would at least be familiar with the basic recitals from the Qur'ān. Consequently, the following is from Sūrah al-Qāriʿah:

فَأَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِيْنُهُ فَهُوَ فِيْ عِيْشَةٍ رَاضِيَةٍ وَأَمَّا مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِيْنُهُ فَأُمُّهُ هَاوِيَةٌ وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا هِيَهْ نَارٌ حَامِيَةٌ

> *As for one whose scales are heavy (with good deeds), he will be in a pleasant life. As for one whose scales are light, his refuge will be an abyss. And what do you know what that is? It is a fire, intensely hot.*[1]

Therefore, if one who has been praised by Allah and the illustrious Imāms is sinful in any way, he would still be entitled to Paradise if his good deeds exceed his bad deeds. Now, despite all of this if one has reservations then it is similar to the saying:

مدعی سست گواہ چست

The plaintiff is confident, the evidence weak.

Or like the Arabic saying:

رضي الخصمان و ما رضي القاضي

The claimant and defendant are satisfied but the judge still harbours a grudge.

Similarly, Allah is happy with him and so too are the illustrious Imāms but the Shīʿah still have qualms about the matter.

The promises of Paradise and forgiveness for the Muhājirīn

If this still offends the Shīʿah then let us assume that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِیَ اللّٰہُ عَنْہُ good deeds are not more than his evil deeds, then there is absolutely no doubt that he was from the early Muhājirīn and among the first Companions of the Prophet صَلَّی اللّٰہُ عَلَیْہِ وَسَلَّمَ, whose merits and virtue are contained in the commentary of the verse:

وَالسَّابِقُوْنَ الْأَوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِيْنَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِيْنَ اتَّبَعُوْهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَّضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوْا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِيْ تَحْتَهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِيْنَ فِيْهَا أَبَدًا ۚ ذٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيْمُ

> *And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct, Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.*[2]

---

1 Sūrah al-Qāriʿah: 6-11.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.

This verse states that Allah is pleased with the forerunners of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and they are pleased with Him and He has prepared Gardens of Paradise for them. Similarly, they have been promised the forgiveness of Allah and a tremendous reward from Him. So, assuming that his sins are excessive or worse that he was a compulsive sinner and transgressor, then too he cannot be criticised because the word of Allah is true and His promise must be fulfilled. Unlike the Shīʿah whose religion is completely obscure and whose words have no value.

Nevertheless, these verses convince us that Allah is extremely pleased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ even if the Shīʿah are angry with him. Furthermore, their displeasure with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ only entitles them to the displeasure of Allah and their illustrious Imāms.

It is impossible to fathom that the illustrious Imāms know that Allah's pleasure rests in a certain decision and they do not conform to it. Instead one can assert that on the basis of their nobility and purity, even if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ had infringed on their rights in any way they would willingly forego it and approve of all his actions, simply because they know that Allah approves of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ.

Similarly, there is no need for the Ahl al-Bayt to overlook his misdeeds or approve of him because if Allah is pleased with anyone, he will please all those people who have claims against him or ill-feelings for him. The Noble Qur'ān therefore says:

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِمْ مِنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَى سُرُرٍ مُتَقَابِلِيْنَ

And We will remove whatever is in their breasts of resentment, [so they will be] brothers, on thrones facing each other.[1]

This establishes that such people would be united in Paradise who had previously harboured enmity or rancour towards each other. However, when Allah admits them to Paradise, He will remove these sentiments from their hearts and they would be like brothers unto each other. The same should be applicable in this context too.

Therefore, the Shīʿah are compelled to accept that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ is entitled to Paradise because of the testimony of Allah and the illustrious

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 47.

Imāms. As for the Ahl al-Bayt, the Sunnī and Shīʿah are unanimous about them being entitled to Paradise. However, considering their obstinacy, it would not be too farfetched to assume that the Shīʿah could actually dispute their admission to Paradise [simply because they are unhappy about their testimony in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ]. Nevertheless, when both groups will enter paradise, their grievances would be resolved and their enmity would be history.

Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام burning the calf was rational

If the followers of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba' fail to understand even after such an elaborate response and they choose to be like the Banī Isrā'īl who were swayed by one deception of Sāmirī and began worshipping the calf despite witnessing the phenomenal miracles of Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, as a result of which Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was compelled to destroy the calf—which cried out after being touched by the dust of Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام—so that it would bring them back to their senses and they could see that it was not an object worthy of worship. When it can be destroyed by a mere mortal how can it ever be regarded as an object of worship. In the same vein, if my elaborate arguments and evidence fails to make them understand then I should physically amputate the hands of ʿAmmār ʿAlī who can do no more than repeat the baseless allegations of the ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba', so that it may serve as a lesson to those whom reason and logic does appeal to and display his lack of support.

Basing the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate on the verse regarding the rights of relatives

As for the cunning manner in which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has presented his case regarding the Fadak Estate, it cannot stir the faith of those who are protected by Allah. Yes, the dim-witted, foolish followers of ʿAmmār ʿAlī—apologies if this seems offensive—do get ensnared in such traps. The details of this are as follows: In his correspondence to Mīr Nādir Shāh—which reflects no brilliance or any intelligence on his part—ʿAmmār ʿAlī states the following:

Consequently, Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī (in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*), ʿAlī Muttaqī (in *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*), Abū ʿAlī Mawṣilī and the author of *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* and many other scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that when the following verse was revealed, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, who the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to and what was their right:

وَأْتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right.[1]

Upon which Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said that the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to Fāṭimah, and that Fadak was her right. Consequently, the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ assigned Fadak to Fāṭimah. The reports which these scholars record establishes that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah and that it belonged solely to her.

When the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left this world and Abū Bakr succeeded him, he took Fadak away forcefully and deprived her of any rights to it. Is this not usurpation?

A historical assessment of the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate

Now listen to our response which is presented hereunder. Firstly, did it not occur to ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his accomplices that the allegation of usurping Fadak is a rather old and worn out allegation which the Shīʿah continue to unearth from time to time. Therefore, the Fadak issue is something which the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have responded to with conclusive evidence and stunning responses, such that it should deter any Shīʿah from even contemplating to bring up the issue again. So, if *al-Ṣawāʿiq* is not easily found—and *al-Ṣawāʿiq* is not available in print—then surely the *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Muḥaddith Delhwī is available. If not, then *Munāzir be Badal*—of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī—is easily available in Lucknow. All the above have elaborate and unparalleled responses to the issue of Fadak. How inappropriate it is to repeat the allegation when the Shīʿah are mute in their response to these books? Forget feeling ashamed before Allah—if they possess such shame—do they not feel ashamed before people for repeating the issue of Fadak when they have no response to our rebuttals?

No matter how silly someone maybe, if they receive a sensible and reasonable clarification to a misconception they are silenced and leave the matter to rest. However, this is the trait of cowards who can only wag their tongues and do no more than that. Whilst there is no need for us to repeat our response, it is important to uncover the reality since ʿAmmār ʿAlī has raised the issue with the perception that it is a valid allegation against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 26.

The verse in question has no relevance to the issue of Fadak

ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his followers have no knowledge of the Qur'ān and they never will have knowledge of it. If anyone wishes to prove this, then they should ask him in which Juz' can the above verse be found in? Similarly, if he and the likes of him had any understanding of the Qur'ān they would not have quoted this verse regarding the Fadak Estate at all. Consequently, the above verse appears twice in the Noble Qur'ān; in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl and in Sūrah al-Rūm and both were revealed during the Makkan period of the Prophet ﷺ life. Whilst the above fact may be common knowledge to scholars, any unlearned person may pick up any copy of the Qur'ān and confirm this status of these two chapters. If the Shīʿah do not accept this testimony for any reason and they feel that the Qur'ān would always be in favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah, then we would provide evidence to them from their resources. Consequently, al-Ṭabarsī states the following in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān*:

سورة الروم مكّية إلا قوله : فسبحان الله إلخ

> Sūrah al-Rūm is a Makkī Sūrah, with the exception of the verse: "So exalted is Allah when you reach the evening and when you reach the morning."

Consequently, when al-Ṭabarsī advocates that the Prophet ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and he asserts that Sūrah al-Rūm is from the Makkan period, then we would like to ask him if there was any existence of Fadak at that time. The Fadak Estate only came into the Prophet's ﷺ possession six or seven years after the migration to Madīnah. Therefore, if for arguments sake any authentic Sunnī reference were to suggest that this verse was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, then too the Shīʿah should have rejected it, based upon what is stated by their scholars.

Thus, it is established that this is but an allegation of the Shīʿah. However, if someone were to suggest that "Makkī" also refers to a verse revealed in Makkah or in the precincts of Makkah after hijrah. Therefore, it is possible that these chapters are classified as "Makkī" on account of being revealed during the Conquest of Makkah; we would say that the background for the opening verses of Sūrah al-Rūm as well as the circumstances relating to the following verse of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl disprove this possibility:

وَلَا تَجْهَرْ بِصَلَاتِكَ

And do not recite (too) loudly in your prayer.[1]

In addition to this, Dildār ʿAlī's only refutation of the Ahl al-Sunnah's reference to the following verse used to prove the prohibition of Mutʿah was that it is a Makkī verse:

إِلَّا عَلَىٰ أَزْوَاجِهِمْ أَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ

Except from their wives or those their right hands possess.[2]

Accordingly, his refutation will only be valid if the common meaning of the terms Makkī and Madanī are implied (that Makkī refers to revelation before hijrah and Madanī refers to revelation after Hijrah]. In this case, Dildār ʿAlī concurs with our view and any other explanation by the Shīʿah has no merit.

The implications of their interpretation of the verse

Firstly, for those who insist that this is the correct meaning and interpretation of the words "Dhū al-Qurbā" and "their rights", do they not realise the implications of this interpretation. Whilst the Ahl al-Sunnah has the blessing of īmān and conviction and they are aware that the Shīʿah have fabricated this narration regarding Fadak, what about the perception that it creates for Jews, Christians and Hindus who may be conversant with Arabic, as they have no īmān and no regard for the Prophet's ﷺ honour? Are the Shīʿah not giving them the opportunity to accuse the Prophet ﷺ of hankering after worldly gains and using the reference of Jibrīl عليه السلام conveniently and cunningly so that nobody would contest what he has acquired for his daughter?

The reality is that their interpretation has absolutely no relationship with the verse of the Noble Qur'ān. This is because al-Qurbā refers to every close relative and why should Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها be implied exclusively? The Prophet's ﷺ many close relatives include Sayyidah Ruqayyah, Sayyidah Zaynab, and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm who are his biological daughters according to the testimony of the Qur'ān and credible Shīʿī references. Consequently, *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī—the most

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 110.

2 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 6.

authentic reference of the Shīʿah—affirms that they were no less than Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا in their relationship to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. We have recorded this issue already. And if anyone were to say that their demise occurred prior to the revelation of this verse then we would refute it because they passed away in Madīnah whilst the verse is Makkī.

Secondly, we attest that Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Sayyidunā Jaʿfar, and others were alive when the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ received the Fadak Estate and it is unanimously agreed upon that all of them were the very close relatives of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Why then did the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ hand over Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا only and deprive the rest of their due right? And if anyone doubts this, then we present ʿAmmār ʿAlī himself to testify to the meaning of this verse. He says: "And O Muḥammad; give your relatives their due."

The above establishes the meaning of al-Qurbā. As for confining the implication of "their right" to Fadak, it is completely baseless and meaningless. Does it not occur to them at all that whilst such flaws could certainly be attributed to them, what if this criticism actually goes against Allah and His Messenger? Perhaps these collaborators felt that if Allah and His Messenger do not conform to our views, we would attempt to force them to conform to it even against their wishes.

Thirdly, when they failed to give the Noble Qur'ān its due for being the miraculous Word of Allah and when they failed to accord due honour to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they committed such a foolish act and fabricated reports which lack substance even in the view of those who are not too learned, making them doubt the very eloquence and profoundness which the Qur'ān is acclaimed for. They could actually suggest that the verse be re-phrased probably in the following manner so that it be eloquent and precise:

وآت فاطمة فدك

And give Fadak to Fāṭimah.

Accusing the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ of oppressing his relatives

Fourthly, if the Fadak estate lawfully came into the possession of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا prior to the revelation of this verse and, Allah forbid, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

withheld it from her, then it would be correct to refer to it with the word "Their right" which means: "That which she is entitled to and which is her right." This is because withholding that which is due to another is rightfully referred to as withholding the next person's ḥaqq. In this instance it would be justified if the word ḥaqq is used and would be understood by common sense.

Therefore, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī's interpretation were acceptable and it is assumed—despite it being impossible—that the Prophet ﷺ withheld it from her, then it implies that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها already acquired possession of Fadak before the revelation of this verse. However, this is in conflict with the Shīʿī view as they also refute that she purchased it. As for her gaining possession of it as a gift from the Prophet ﷺ—which is their stance—then they maintain that it occurred after the revelation of this verse. Their stance on Fadak is that it was a gift that the Prophet ﷺ gave to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Based on this, it is known that prior to a probable gift it is regarded as the possession of the owner until it is actually made over to the one intended to receive it. And since it is in the Prophet's ﷺ possession, it would be incorrect to interpret "Their right" to refer to the Fadak Estate. This highlights the foolishness of the one who has concocted such a report.

Khums becomes forbidden for the Banū Hāshim

Fifthly, if we were to entertain ʿAmmār ʿAlī's explanation and concede that "Dhū al-Qurbā refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah and "their right" refers to Fadak, then what would his response be if this implies that every instance in the Qur'ān where al-Qurbā appears it refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها only. If so, it means that none of the Banū Hāshim have any rights to the Khums with the exception of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. This is based on their interpretation of al-Qurbā and it appears in the following verse too:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلّٰهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبَى وَالْيَتَامَى وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for his near relatives (Dhū al-Qurbā) and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveler.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

The above distribution of the khums is ordained by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Muslims have no authority in this regard. Based on Dhū al-Qurbā referring to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا only, would it imply that none of her descendants or none of the Banu Hāshim are entitled to it after her demise? This is in conflict with the Shī'ī view as well which stipulates that half of the khums is for the Imām of the time and the remaining should be distributed to orphans, the destitute and travellers. Their reference to the Imām refers to one of the Twelve infallible Imāms. Therefore, based on their interpretation, that which Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ received from the khums during his reign as the Khalīfah, or that which Imām al-Mahdī would take is all ḥarām and unlawful.

If any Shī'ah were to suggest that despite the khums being due to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا exclusively, the Imāms have a share as they are her inheritors then I would say to them that is it not true that inheritors inherit according to the share allotted to them by the Noble Qur'ān. Why then is the Imām entitled to half of the khums in exclusion to the rest of the Sayyid progeny?

What about the spoils of war after the demise of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا?

Sixthly, if we were to accept that these few individuals inherited due to being the legitimate heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then what about the spoils of war which were obtained during the era of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well as that which would be attained in the era of Imām al-Mahdi? Surely this cannot be regarded as the property or estate of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا since possession and ownership demands that the person be alive. What would be the relevance of Allah's words regarding the spoils of war then be if al-Qurbā refers only to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا?

Seventhly, when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا did not have possession of it then how did the infallible Imāms take a portion from it? Assuming that her heirs were not entitled to her share of the khums—which requires her possession over it first—but that they actually inherited her rights to the khums itself, then on what basis would the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا inherit the rights to the khums exclusively, whereas the progenies of the orphans, travellers and destitute who lived in the era of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are not entitled to the same? If inheriting the rights to the khums is valid for the Imāms then it should also be applicable to the progenies of the orphans and destitute as well, irrespective of their financial status since inheritance after all is not governed by a recipient's financial status.

Nonetheless, it goes without saying that the verse actually instructs the Prophet ﷺ to give all his relatives their full due and this meaning is clearly understood by anyone who has perception of the language.

Eighthly, if al-Qurbā refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and Fadak is her due, it implies that the Prophet ﷺ is absolved of his obligation to her simply by giving Fadak to her. As for the remaining wealth of the Prophet ﷺ which he received before or after that, either as khums or as Fay' (booty received through a covenant) or whatever else could be the purport of the word ḥaqq, it should then be solely for the orphans, destitute and travellers. It is evident that Fadak is not even a thousandth portion of this entire sum. Therefore, based on the Shīʿī view, Allah has been grossly unfair in this distribution as Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها simply inherits a tiny portion of her father's estate and the rest is for strangers. Is it only the Fadak Estate which Allah desired her to have?

Even if this distribution of shares seems inappropriate, the Ahl al-Sunnah have an adequate response to it because we maintain the following:

ذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَاءُ

That is the bounty of Allah , which He gives to whom He wills.[1]

وَاللّٰهُ يَرْزُقُ مِنْ يَشَاءُ

And Allah gives provision to whom He wills.[2]

But the Shīʿah have an issue with this distribution as they maintain that it is obligatory upon Allah to be just and fair in matters of this nature. So how tragic is it, Allah forbid, that Allah was unjust by giving less to those who were more-deserving and more to those who were less-deserving?

Ninthly, if the Shīʿah were to turn around and place the blame on the Ahl al-Sunnah by saying that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has taken this report—of the meaning of this verse—from Sunnī references and it is found in their very own books so if its implications are offensive then we are not guilty of any crime. In this case we would say to them

1 Sūrah al-Jumuʿah: 4.

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 38.

that this report is actually reported in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī. Consequently, this report—which states that the Prophet ﷺ handed over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah upon the revelation of this verse—is transmitted from Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī and reported by Imām al-Bāqir and Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.

Why is the Fadak narration recorded in Sunnī references?

As for this report appearing in Sunnī references, the logical response to it is as follows: This report is a pure fabrication of the Shīʿah and the discussion in the last few pages affirms this. It should also be known that the Ahl al-Sunnah are not so gullible that they cannot discern between truth and falsehood. In addition to this, most of the Sunnī scholars have memorised the Noble Qur'ān and are therefore aware of the proper context of each verse; and they are also aware of all-resembling verses relating to any particular issue. In contrast to this, the Shīʿah with their crooked minds and their inability to retain the glorious Qur'ān or understand verses in its proper context generally misconstrue the facts. It is by the grace of Allah that the Ahl al-Sunnah are immune from such folly and just as how gold and silver can be put to the test, the Ahl al-Sunnah check reports and narrations against the word of Allah, determining authentic from weak. Why then would they record such a narration which besides lacking authentic transmission and being in conflict with the context of this verse suggests through its very wording and content that it is unreliable? Instead, this is the scheming and plotting of Shīʿī scholars who thereby wish to sway simple-minded Sunnīs from the straight path.

The narration is in conflict with the context of the Qur'ān

Firstly, this narration is in conflict with the context within which this verse appears and I plead to those who have any sense of justice and impartiality to pay attention to this elaboration simply for the sake of justice. Therefore, consider the second rukūʿ of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl which commences at

وَ قَضٰى رَبُّكَ

And your Lord has decreed

and continues till:

وَأْتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَى

And give the relatives

Is the address here specific to the Prophet ﷺ or is it intended for the general Ummah? It is evident that the address is directed to the Ummah in general. This is because all the following words have the plural personal pronoun:

أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوْا

That you [plural] not worship

رَبُّكُمْ أَعْلَمُ بِمَا فِيْ نُفُوْسِكُمْ

Your Lord is most knowing of what is within yourselves

وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْا أَوْلَادَكُمْ

And do not [plural] kill your children[1]

Therefore, despite "When one of them nears old age" and "Give the Dhū al-Qurbā" appearing to be directed to the Prophet ﷺ, the reason for its singularity is simply because the Prophet ﷺ is being spoken to and because this is a continuation from "*Your Rabb has decreed*". Therefore, the reality is that despite "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" appearing to be an address to the Prophet ﷺ only, "*That you not worship*" and the likes of it and the nature of these commands make it evident that it is a general address to one and all. The only difference between "*That you not worship*" and "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is that in the first case one address is directed to one and all but in the second case the address is repeated individually to each and every one to whom the address could be relevant.

If it is said that "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" seems to be exclusively directed to the Prophet ﷺ, since it is connected to "*And your Lord has decreed*", then this matter needs to be referred to those who are acquainted with the science of ʿIlm al-Maʿānī, who will explain the issues relating to an *Inshā'* (a directive) being connected to a *Khabar* (a statement). Since there is no conformity between the two, it simply cannot be connected to each other. Similarly, the issue of a past-tense verb being connected

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 23-31.

to a direct command is also not in order. Therefore, if it is connected to anything then it (*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*) is actually connected to "*That you not worship*".

However, if it is said that "*And your Lord has decreed*" is apparently a *khabar* (information) but its implication is that of a direct command and this is based on "*That you not worship*" also being a direct command in the same passage then it would be said that just as "*That you not worship*" supports the fact that the khabar denotes a direct command, it also establishes that the command given here in these verses is all-inclusive and not exclusive.

It would then be relevant to ask why the address is not standard in the entire passage, if the address is meant for the entire Ummah? Why is a plural personal pronoun not used throughout the passage or why is the singular one not used? Therefore, it would be said that when multiple commands are being issued at once and one particular command is more prominent then the others, or when it is perceived that those who are being addressed may be complacent about a particular issue, then it demands that the address be made directly to each and every individual concerned. Consequently, since the folly of shirk and the importance of kindness to parents is logical, it was not deemed necessary to add emphasis or to warn about its importance in strong terms. However, its precedence over the rest of the commands issued thereafter does signify its added importance.

In this light, the rights of relatives are an issue which most people are complacent about. Based on this, it required added emphasis and the change of expression serves this requirement. Similarly, the command of Tawhīd and abstention from shirk directs us about our relationship with Allah. As for the remaining verses regarding the rights of others and the prohibition of extravagance and waste it highlights the manner in which we should deal with the creation of Allah. Therefore, dealings are of two types: the manner of dealing with Allah and the manner of dealing with His creation. In the same manner, commands and prohibitions are also of two types.

Since the object of these verses is to rectify dealings, and dealings occur between two parties, whereas the relationship with Allah and dealing with Him, all the creation are equal in this regard and Allah is One only; His relationship with His creation is the same. Therefore, this could be considered as one standard form of transacting. As for people dealing with people, each person is unique in this regard since every person's relatives are different and the relationship with

each one differs. Therefore, the manner in which he deals with each one of them would be different. Consider then that when the relationship with Allah is one standard relationship, then one all-inclusive address was adequate and when the relationship with individuals is multi-faceted, then the address ought to be repeated and directed to each and every individual specifically.

The address is specific but the implication is general

If somebody stills has reservations after this explanation then it would simply be on the basis of being biased and prejudiced, but this would not affect our argument in any way because even if the address in "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is directed exclusively to the Prophet ﷺ then too it would be applicable to the entire Ummah. Consider the next verse which is as follows:

إِمَّا يَبْلُغَنَّ عِنْدَكَ الْكِبَرَ أَحَدُهُمَا أَوْ كِلَاهُمَا فَلَا تَقُلْ لَّهُمَا أُفٍّ وَلَا تَنْهَرْهُمَا وَقُلْ لَّهُمَا قَوْلًا كَرِيْمًا

Whether one or both of them reach old age [while] with you, say not to them [so much as], "uff," and do not repel them but speak to them a noble word.

The Prophet ﷺ began receiving revelation at the age of forty and he had lost both his parents by the time he was six years old. Now if this address is exclusively to the Prophet ﷺ then all that could be said is that although Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is speaking to the Prophet ﷺ the message is actually for the entire Ummah. Therefore, the situation with "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is the same as this.

Similarly, the philosophy of directing an address to the most prominent person is to emphasise its importance to all those who are lower in rank. A king may sometime direct an address to his most important minister or officer, thereby sending a clear message of its importance to the rest of his subjects.

Therefore, "*Whether one or both of them reach old age*" establishes that even though the address is exclusive, the implication is general.

The verse that follows regarding extravagance also proves that this is not some exclusive command for the Prophet ﷺ only and that compliance is mandatory by one and all.

Similarly, this passage establishes that parents are included under "*Dhū al-Qurbā*". In fact, their rights are highly emphasised here. "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" can only be regarded as an all-inclusive command if "*their rights*" denotes kindness to relatives, which is the obvious implication of this word and not the Fadak Estate. If it refers to Fadak then how could every Muslim possess a Fadak Estate to be handed over to his relatives? Therefore, the context in which this verse appears in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl refutes the validity of that report.

The verse from Sūrah al-Rūm

The same applies to this verse in the context in which it appears in Sūrah al-Rūm. If one has to consider the verses carefully from:

أَنَّ اللّٰهَ يَبْسُطُ الرِّزْقَ

Allah extends provision

Until after:

فَأٰتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

So give the relative his right,[1]

One would realize that although the address is to the Prophet ﷺ, the implication is general. Consequently, the passage commences by saying that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ grants ample provision to whomsoever He wishes and He puts whomsoever He wishes under financial constraints. Following on this, Allah then commands the Prophet ﷺ to grant the next of kin, the destitute and the travelers their due. Therefore, it is the wisdom of Allah which demands that people should experience financial constraints, thus their due must be given to them in the order in which they appear here. Allah then says that spending on these categories of people is better for those who believe in Allah and seek His pleasure, for they are the ones that will triumph. The verses that follow hereon also have a general implication. Consequently, from the manner in which "*That is best for those who desire the countenance of Allah*" has been phrased establishes that this injunction is general. If this were said to refer to the granting of Fadak, then we can make no sense of it.

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 37-38.

Therefore, the Shīʿī argument regarding Fadak was based on this verse of Sūrah al-Rūm and its response has been provided.

Misinterpreting the words "their rights

If "their rights" truly refers to the Fadak Estate then there are two possibilities: either Fadak is the actual, literal meaning of the word "*ḥaqq*" or Fadak is one constituent of the comprehensive meaning of "*ḥaqq*". This is like the case of a person having perception of a car[1], enquires about it from the next person. Incidentally a car goes by, whereupon the second person says, "This is a car." Now it is evident that this is not a comprehensive and elaborate response. Instead, it is one example of a car so that he may have an idea of the basic composition and components of a car. Based on this, could it be possible to assume that the Prophet ﷺ was unaware of the implications of the "*ḥaqq*" (rights) of relatives whereby Jibrīl عليه السلام cited this example to give him an idea?

Let us refute both the above possibilities and seek a third possibility so that we may understand why Jibrīl عليه السلام gave the response of 'Fadak' to the enquiry of ḥaqq? Perhaps the Prophet ﷺ was enquiring about the quantity that is due to relatives, whereupon Jibrīl ﷺ offered the above response.

It is evident that all three possibilities are irrelevant and inappropriate and that the term ḥaqq is self-explanatory and requires no clarification.

As for the first possibility, who could ever claim that ḥaqq means Fadak. Considering the second possibility, it could only be the audacity of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the likes of him to entertain the idea of the Prophet ﷺ being unaware of the meaning of the word ḥaqq and it would be preposterous to assume that Jibrīl عليه السلام used the example of Fadak to give him an idea of what ḥaqq could entail. As for the third possibility—that the Prophet ﷺ was enquiring about the due portion to be given to relatives—whilst it can be a relevant possibility, it is also inadequate for a few reasons. Firstly, there is no limit to the rights of relatives and Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah are unanimous on this. Secondly, if the question related to the portion due to relatives, the answer ought to have been given using fractions such as half one third, etc. Therefore, this possibility cannot be valid because the answer is not compatible with the question. If the Shīʿah accept this as the correct possibility then just as the

1 The actual example is about a horse. We have substituted it for a car.

Ghurābiyyah (an old Shīʿī sect) believed, they too ought to accept that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was actually instructed to take the revelation to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he conveyed it to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم in gross error. This is because attributing this shallow response to Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is similar to the other folly attributed to him by the Ghurābiyyah.

Therefore, all three possibilities are fundamentally flawed. Yes; if Fadak was in the ownership of Sayyidah Fāṭimah and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم had taken control of it somehow, it would have been correct to interpret ḥaqq as Fadak, but what can we do if not only the Ahl al-Sunnah but the Shīʿah too reject this idea of Fadak being in her possession before the revelation of this verse. It is unanimously agreed upon that Fadak belonged to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم.

Just as these three possibilities are incorrect, the same three possibilities would be incorrect when attempting to justify the interpretation of Dhū al-Qurbā as a reference to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

What about the share of the destitute and the traveller?

Similarly, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم was unaware of the meanings of Dhū al-Qurbā and "their rights" then the words "destitute" and "traveller" are no less obscure. Especially if the question was about quantity, then such a question is more relevant in relation to the destitute and the traveller as there is no norm in society for allotting a share to them, whereas the rights of relatives are prevalent in all cultures and societies. So why did the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم seek clarification on the quantity due to relatives but failed to enquire about the due of the destitute and traveller?

If it is conveniently stated that all these details have not been transmitted in this single report then we could accept it, but we would then ask you to produce the reports which stipulate the identities of these destitute people and travellers just as the identity of Sayyidah Fāṭimah had been stipulated. Such reports should also provide details about that which is due to them. This is because all three categories—Dhū al-Qurbā, the destitute and the traveller—feature equally in these verses as well as in the following verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلّٰهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبَى
وَالْيَتَامَى وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ

> *And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveler.*[1]

If they are mentioned collectively then why was the Prophet ﷺ not concerned about that which is due to them as he was concerned about Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها?

Just as aḥādīth regarding kindness to the destitute and the traveller are profusely found in the reference books of Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah, the aḥādīth regarding the merits of kindness to relatives are equally profuse. Therefore, if the Prophet ﷺ was aware of their rights in light of these aḥādīth reported from him, then he was equally aware of the rights and dues of relatives by virtue of the aḥādīth reported regarding them. If there was no need to seek elaboration regarding the destitute and traveller, there was also no need for clarification regarding relatives.

And if it is stated that the aḥādīth regarding kindness to relatives were only uttered after the revelation of these verses then the same would be said regarding the aḥādīth related to the destitute and the traveller. However, no one has a historical record of such reports.

If this is a Madanī verse it is governed by the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl

The discussion relating to this verse thus far was based on it being a Makkī verse and this is the case as accepted by all scholars, especially Shīʿī scholars. However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has decided to differ with this view and has classified it a Madanī verse, based on a report of Wāqidī and Bashīr ibn Walīd. If we were to accept that it is Madanī too and that it was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, then we would have a dispute over a particular issue. If we assume that this verse was revealed after Khaybar then there is no disagreement about the verse "*And know that anything you obtain of war booty*" being revealed before it and that all spoils of war were distributed according to the directives outlined in this verse.

If this is the case, then there was absolutely no need for the Prophet ﷺ to seek clarification from Jibrīl عليه السلام as "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā their rights*" has its precedent. Similarly, the preceding revelation of the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl demands that the

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

Prophet ﷺ was familiar with the details relating to relatives, orphans, the destitute and the travellers.

Therefore, we have responded adequately to all possibilities regarding the narration of Fadak and for numerous factors it can be concluded that this narration is but a fabrication. The Ahl al-Sunnah have no reservations about the true nature of this narration.

As for the verse "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*", it is clear-cut and does not require elaboration from the likes of the Fadak narration. It simply advocates kindness and good treatment of relatives, orphans, travellers and the destitute. In the case of relatives, they enjoy rights according to the degree of closeness and love, courtesy and humility is due to all of them. Parents deserve to be honoured and served; children must be loved and reared correctly; brothers and sisters must be treated with noble character and generosity. Therefore, whilst the address is directed to the Prophet ﷺ, the implications are general and every Muslim must comply. In no way does this verse instruct the Prophet ﷺ to simply settle the issue of family rights by giving Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī—evidence of forgery and fabrication

As for a professional and academic review of this narration in order to determine its veracity, it will be discussed shortly. To begin with, there is no doubt about the falsity of this narration simply on account of the dubious ʿAmmār ʿAlī expressing that it is found in authentic Sunnī traditions. What could discredit this report more than the fact that ʿAmmār ʿAlī makes reference to it? This is because ʿAmmār ʿAlī's credibility and merit in transmitting reports is well-known. Consequently, the reality of his reports about Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm; the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ as well as about Umm Kulthūm—daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ—has passed earlier on. His zeal and determination to defend the Shīʿī view made him discredit Shīʿī scholars and authentic Shīʿī references. His desire to establish an accusation against the Ahl al-Sunnah brought out the worst in him and if he had no fear of Allah whilst doing this, he could have at least felt ashamed of people and at least be concerned about putting his reputation at stake. But alas, the wonder of Taqiyyah, it settles both problems at once.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to highlight the status of this narration for those who are in anticipation of such clarification, so that the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah

is evident and the deviation of the Shīʿah is established. Before proceeding with that, ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have a grievance as we have disgraced him by some of these remarks, but would we ever do such a thing? Your religion is deception through and through, and if our response exposes your steadfastness upon deception then you should be thankful for that.

Six conditions for the validity and credibility of a book

Firstly, books are written by people and just as people are honest or dishonest, wise or foolish, books would also be the same. Consequently, irreligious people have authored many books, contaminated them with their poisonous ideology and they have attributed these works to men of great learning and integrity.

Similarly, many books were neither written for public review nor intended for educational benefit to the masses. Instead, they were written as personal manuscripts so that the author may review the narrations and investigate the reports thoroughly before presenting a final script. Some of these personal manuscripts were passed on to people without the due process being completed.

Other books are extremely rare and very hard to come by. They are actually considered to be lost or non-existent. It has happened that irreligious people came upon these 'lost' works and then contaminated it before presenting it to people. At times, when disputing with the Ahl al-Sunnah, they attribute reports to such works in order to silence the Ahl al-Sunnah. This has been a trick of the Shīʿah throughout the ages. It is therefore imperative for the Sunnī scholar to ascertain the narrations they quote and verify the source.

The first condition: Factual substance

Firstly, presenting facts to the reader should be the primary motive of the author rather than gathering tales and fictitious events, the purpose of which is to entertain or amuse. If leisure-reading, thrilling and amusing the reader is the objective, then these types of books ought to be in the possession of each and every person.

The second condition: Impartiality of the author

The author must not be biased to anyone nor have any prejudice. His integrity in relating events must be so evident that there should be no reason to doubt what he says or writes.

The third condition: Familiarity of the author

In addition to having integrity, credibility and truthfulness, the author must have complete or satisfactory acquaintance with the subject or branch of knowledge his book relates to. He should not be like the proverbial "*half-baked Molvī*", who is a threat to one's īmān, or the quack who poses a threat to one's life.

The fourth condition: Non-Obscurity in transmission

Along with the above conditions, the book should be renowned throughout the ages and it should be passed on to us in every generation by people who meet the above criteria. If we do not stipulate this condition, then it demands that we accept the Old and New Testament just as we accept the Qur'ān, since they are equally classified as the books of Allah. Could that ever be possible?

The fifth condition: Authenticity [in ḥadīth collections]

In the case of ḥadīth compilations, there is an added condition which is of fundamental importance; the author must undertake commitment to record only that which is authentic and genuine. This is similar to the manner in which the compilers of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth have undertaken to record only that which is legitimate and authentic. It is for this very reason that these six collections are often referred to as *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*.

However, if the document is but a manuscript in which the author has recorded all the records which were available to him at that time with the intention of sifting them out later and retaining only that which is highly-authentic—as Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim have done—or recording the weak and fabricated reports too along with its classification—as Imām Tirmidhī has done—but for some unforeseen circumstance he was unable to realise his objective, then such a document cannot be accepted verbatim without scrutiny.

On this basis it would not be inappropriate to say that no author has produced the final script of his work in an instant. Consequently, it is credibly reported that Imām al-Bukhārī gathered his Ṣaḥīḥ from 600 000 aḥādīth that were available to him. In fact, Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-Razzāq reports that Imām al-Bukhārī compiled his manuscript for *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* three times.[1]

---

1 *Muqaddimah Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhari* – Maṭbaʿ Aḥmadī – Delhi.

It is therefore established that the scholars of ḥadīth had manuscripts from which their final works were prepared. Let us assume that Imām al-Bukhārī left behind his collection of 600 000 aḥādīth without having an opportunity to scan and review it, would anyone consider it reliable and valid? It is obvious that he scanned it because he did not regard all of it to be beyond a trace of doubt. When he felt this way about it, how could we compel ourselves to accept it simply because it was gathered by the leader of all scholars of ḥadīth from then till the end of time?

Therefore, if anyone comes across a ḥadīth document of this nature—irrespective of who it was gathered by—it would be common sense that such a document has no relevance if the author did not accomplish the task of gathering the authentic narrations only and/or classifying the status of the narrations.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī on the other hand—the erudite scholar of ḥadīth that he is—must be excluded from the list of those whom common sense appeals to as is clearly evident from his letter. But is not silence the best reply to a fool?

Nevertheless, this condition is of fundamental importance and many people have been deceived by reference to unauthentic works of highly-acknowledged scholars of Islam.

The sixth condition: Selecting between one of two non-reconciliatory reports

If there is serious conflict between narrations and there is no possibility of reconciliation, then preference must be given to one by assessing the narrators of each report. If preference is not given to one over the other, then the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah would both consider their collections of narrations credible and this is simply not possible. Consequently, al-Kulaynī states the Qur'ān initially comprised of 17 000 verses, all of which were removed with the exception of that which remains in the scripts of the Qur'ān today. In contrast to this, the credible Ibn Bābuwayh states that the Qur'ān is only that which is preserved till this day. Obviously both reports cannot be valid and both reports can also not be dismissed; one has to be preferred over the other.

Having established this, it must be known that the particular narration which ʿAmmār ʿAlī refers to, i.e. the Fadak report, and all other narrations supposedly from Sunnī references, which the Shīʿah use as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah, are not valid references. The credibility of a person is questionable if even one lie

is established against him and ʿAmmār ʿAlī's deception has been discovered and exposed repeatedly. Subsequently the readers are aware of his remarks concerning the marriage of Umm Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, as well as his refutation of the biological association of Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It is not necessary to repeat this as we have dealt with it more than once.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has discredited many Shīʿī reports and he has made numerous allegations in his letter to Mīr Nādir ʿAlī. In addition to this, he has audaciously undertaken to forward credible references for the contents of his letter, if and when such references may be required. Besides discrediting his own references, little does he know that the credible works of the Sunnī scholars whom he has referred to, refutes the reports which he ascribes to them. This matter will be presented shortly.

Distorting and tampering with references

Let us assume that these reports are found in some works of Sunnī scholars, then too these works are so rare and hard to find like the eggs of the Dodo bird. Forget memorising and retaining these works, the Ahl al-Sunnah have not even had the opportunity of seeing them ever. If these narrations supposedly exist in these works then just as how some Jews hypocritically adopted Christianity and then tampered with the Bible by adding that which makes no sense at all to it, a man from their progeny, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba', who was as crooked and deviant as them have always looked for opportunities to distort the dīn of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and to destroy the teachings of Islam. Since the majority of the scholars of Christianity were not blessed to commit the Bible to memory and most of them were not diligent in preserving it, these distortions took root and the face of Christianity remains distorted forever.

The meticulous preservation of the resources of the Ahl al-Sunnah

The situation of the Qur'ān is distinctly different; millions of the Ahl al-Sunnah have committed each letter of the Qur'ān to memory and thousands of scholars of ḥadīth have strived diligently to protect the words and purport of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth and many other ḥadīth texts, thereby making it impossible for irreligious people to add or subtract anything from it. In fact, the abundance

of ḥuffāẓ of the Qur'ān and the multitudes of scholars of ḥadīth is a distinguishing factor and a criterion of truth and falsehood between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah. Based on this elaborate endeavour, it has become impossible for them to alter anything from the Qur'ān and the credible and reputable ḥadīth references throughout the ages. Despite all their attempts and wishes, the promise of Allah that states:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

And

وَاللّٰهُ مُتِمُّ نُوْرِهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُوْنَ

Allah will perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.[2]

Serves as a guarantee for the protection and preservation of the Qur'ān and ḥadīth.

Defeated but not deterred in any way, they then decided to tamper with unpopular and seldom heard of references of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and they have contaminated them so deceptively that let alone the laity, a few Ahl al-Sunnah scholars also fell victim to these schemes. The report of Fadak and others which ʿAmmār ʿAlī records in his letter are some examples.

However, the Ahl al-Sunnah has always found within its ranks scholars who are classified as *Muḥaqqiqīn* [erudite research scholars], may Allah reward them abundantly. They saw through the plot and by the grace and mercy of Allah, and alerted the Ummah about it. They saw the signs of falsehood and dubiousness in these reports and taught us how to distinguish between truth and falsehood. Consequently, when we read the refutation of these reports, this will become evident.

Nevertheless, the trickery of these cunning Shī'ī scholars was successful as far as these unpopular, scantly available references are concerned. This is why the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah deal with such references in the same manner in

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 8.

which a Muslim would deal with the available Old and New Testament. Accordingly, the narrations of these references are verified against the narrations which are recorded in the six canonical collections of ḥadīth, and that which conforms is readily accepted; that which is in conflict is simply rejected. Besides that which corresponds and those which conflict, the remainder of its narrations are judged against logical evidence. If it is in conflict with logical evidence, it would be rejected. If not, it is neither accepted nor rejected. Therefore, narrations which are found exclusively in these unpopular books also do not qualify for practice; instead they are neither accepted nor rejected, as is the case with reports found in the Old and New testaments.

The credibility of the author does not necessitate the credibility of the compilation

So, if the Shīʿah are not convinced about these references' lack of credibility—simply because the authors subscribe to the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah—then the Shīʿah must also maintain that just like the Qur'ān, the Old and New Testament must also be considered authentic; simply because it is the Book of Allah too. And (based on their premise) if they do not consider the Old and New Testaments to be authentic, then (Allah forbid) it implies that they have no reliance and confidence in Allah! Well, the Shīʿah would not bother much about this grave allegation since Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى really does not enjoy any credibility in their eyes. Consequently, they have no faith in the All-Encompassing Knowledge and Decisions of Allah and this leads them to hatching the doctrine of *Badā'* (to account for lapses and mistakes). *May the curse of Allah be upon this belief.*

Nevertheless, the Ahl al-Sunnah have no conviction in the contents of those references which are unpopular and rare, especially when the enmity of the Shīʿah is taken into consideration along with the repeated instances of deception perpetrated by leading Shīʿī scholars. Therefore, these references of the Ahl al-Sunnah have been subjected to distortion just like the fate of the Old and New Testaments.

A quotation from Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah

If some simple-minded reader feels that I am making a baseless claim then they may believe what they prefer to believe, but they cannot hold the same view about

the great luminaries of Islam. So they should consider what Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ—who knows more about Shīʿah doctrine then the Shīʿah themselves—writes in the second chapter of the section on the "Deception and Schemes of the Shīʿah", in his *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*. We will reproduce the entire quotation verbatim for purposes of precision.

> The thirty-second scheme
>
> It has been a great endeavour of Shīʿī scholars to include lies and to subject the works of the Ahl al-Sunnah to distortion, especially the texts of Tafsīr and unpopular and hard-to-come-by ḥadīth references, thereby supporting the Shīʿī creed and dealing mighty blows at the roots of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consequently, they have inserted the report relating to gifting of the Fadak Estate in some of the Tafsīr texts by recording it under the exegesis of the verse (And give the Dhū al-Qurbā their right). They record this incident as follows: When the above verse was revealed, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ called Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and gave Fadak over to her.
>
> But as it is commonly said that a liar has very poor memory, they failed to take note that this verse is a Makkī verse and there was no existence of the Fadak Estate in the Makkan period of the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ life. Similarly, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ought to have made an endowment for the traveller and the destitute too, so that he would have complied with the injunction contained in this verse. Their fabricated report reflects poor forgery too since they ought to have said:
>
> وهبها فدك
>
> He gifted Fadak to her
>
> instead of
>
> أعطاها فدك
>
> He gave her Fadak
>
> Nevertheless, there are numerous examples of such distortion in the texts of Tafsīr and Sīrah, and the average—simple minded—Ahl al-Sunnah scholar is really shaken to the core when he comes across them.
>
> During the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, there were two affluent Shīʿah in Delhi. They would write beautiful scripts of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth,

> *Mishkāt* and Tafsīr books, including therein reports which support the Shīʿī creed. They would then commission lavish book-binding with gold and silver decorative work done upon the cover and then sell these books at a measly price to an unsuspecting customer.
>
> Āghā Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAlī Shāh—one of the noted Safavid rulers—employed this very same scheme in Isfahan during his era. However, his scheme did not prove to be effective because the popular references of the Ahl al-Sunnah are so easily and excessively available that such distortions cannot gain acceptance. As for unpopular references, the Ahl al-Sunnah accord no credibility to it at all. This is why (with limited exception of narrations that pertain to advices and admonitions) the Muḥaqqiqīn scholars reject any reference or citation from unpopular Ahl al-Sunnah references. In fact, they would deal with it like the scriptures of previous prophets of Allah, which cannot be used as a basis for any action or belief.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī ascribes some Shīʿī references to Ahl al-Sunnah scholars

If out of consideration for ʿAmmār ʿAlī we were to overlook this and spare him and his 'illustrious' elders from the crime of distorting Ahl al-Sunnah references it would still be of no avail. (The treachery is still glaring and evident). This is because the references which he refers to in his letter, are some which no Sunnī scholar has ever heard of, and there is reference made to some Ahl al-Sunnah scholars without anybody being able to verify their association to the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consider his reference to *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*; not a single Ahl al-Sunnah scholar may have heard about it. Instead, these are those references regarding which Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ writes:

> The twenty-first scheme
>
> They sometimes attribute a scholarly work to a scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah and fill it with reports criticising the Ṣaḥābah as well as fabricated reports that strike at the roots of the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Therefore, if a reference of this nature really does exist (i.e. *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*) then it is but the handiwork of a cunning Shīʿī scholar.

Similarly, some of the Ahl al-Sunnah references he refers to are compilations of Ahl al-Sunnah scholars who lacked proficiency in the science of ḥadīth or the

science of Tārīkh. Therefore, they were unable to distinguish and ascertain truth from falsehood. A reference of this nature is *Maʿārij al-Nubuwwah*. Yes, if he were to record a quotation from *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* instead, it would have been a different matter altogether, but what would ʿAmmār ʿAlī find of use in a reputable book such as *Madārij al-Nubuwwah*?

A word about ʿAllāmah Suyūṭī's compilations

Some of the references which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has referred to have been compiled by those who had complete proficiency and vast knowledge of ḥadīth like ʿAllāmah Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. However, the specific compilation which he refers to is not one of those books wherein Jalāl al-Dīn undertook to gather only that which is authentic and accurate. Instead, the scholars of Islam are aware that he collected all kinds of reports therein as the name *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* itself suggests.

As for his *Tafsīr al-Durr al-Manthūr*, he gathered baseless reports therein too, with the intention of distinguishing between authentic and baseless reports. The same applies to the *Mawḍūʿāt* of Ibn al-Jawzī. Although these two compilations contain all kinds of reports, they do not appear without a classification. The very purpose for gathering and classifying these reports is to avoid a situation where some wretched deceiver, like ʿAmmār ʿAlī, may utilise such reports to misguide simple-minded Muslims. This was also the practice of the former scholars of ḥadīth like Imām Abū Dāwūd and Imām al-Tirmidhī; they classified reports and expressed the weakness contained in some.

Rare references

The balance of the 'Sunnī' references which he refers to are so rare that even if he were to claim that all Shīʿī beliefs and practices conform to its contents then too no one should be fooled by such an assertion. People of integrity have a strong conscience but does a liar have any fear? The inconsistencies and deceit in his letter is sufficient testimony to this and such deceit and is the 'honourable' tradition and legacy of his religious leaders. Consequently, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states the following:

> The twenty-second scheme
>
> This is the scheme of ascribing reports of criticism against the Ṣaḥābah and reports in support of Shīʿī beliefs to references of the Ahl al-Sunnah which

> are rare and non-existent, whereas those books are free of such reports. Since these references are not easily available, reference to them perturbs the common Muslim and they begin to wonder how these inconsistencies could ever be reconciled. However, there is no cause for concern because even if such reports are correctly transmitted from the said references the only need for reconciliation only occurs if the reports are of the same calibre as far as authenticity, popularity, profuse transmission and clarity of purport are concerned. When these criteria cannot be established about these unknown reports then they could not challenge reports which are authentic, well-documented, profusely transmitted and absolutely clear in purport and content.
>
> Added to this is the fact that the Shīʿah only transmit these dubious reports from unavailable references or from references the authors of which have not undertaken to submit only that which is authentic.
>
> Al-Irbilī—the Shīʿī author of *Kashf al-Ghummah*—and al-Ḥillī—author of al-Yaqīn—transmit and document a multitude of these dubious reports and then boast a false victory over the Ahl al-Sunnah. Ibn Ṭā'ūs has filled his compilation with such reports and he feels that he has established heinous allegations against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Nevertheless, when their deceit is clearly established in many ways what can be expected about their transmission from unavailable references? Therefore, one must be convinced that there is no existence of such reports in the said references. If it were to be assumed that it is contained in these references, then it can only be a distortion perpetrated by their cunning scholars. In addition to this, many books were left in their manuscript phase without the authors having an opportunity to prepare the final edition or without them classifying each and every report and clarifying its status.

The opinion of the Muḥaddithīn about Wāqidī

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has also made reference to some books like *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās* which are unheard of and whose authors are unknown, and he has the audacity to say, "*like the Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās, which is one of the reliable references of the Ahl al-Sunnah.*" In addition to this, the report from this particular reference is transmitted on the authority of the notorious Wāqidī, whose accurate reports are also viewed with

scepticism. I wish to highlight the comments of the Muḥaddithīn regarding him to put things in perspective. Consequently, *Majmaʿ al-Biḥār*, quotes Imām Nasa'ī — who is one of the compilers of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth—as saying that there are four great liars who are known for fabricating ḥadīth. These are: Ibn Abī Yaḥyā in Madīnah, Wāqidī in Baghdad, Muqātil ibn al-Yamān in Khurāsān and Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd in Syria. *Sharḥ al-Shifā'* states that there is unanimity about the unreliability of Wāqidī. It also quotes Imām Shafiʿī as saying that the compilations of Wāqidī are baseless. Now ʿAmmār ʿAlī should reflect that when *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās* is an unknown reference and the quotation from it is transmitted by none other than Wāqidī, then how could such facts be used as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

However, if the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah were based on fictitious reports as the Shīʿī creed is, then there would be no harm in accepting such a fallacious report of Wāqidī from *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*. Nevertheless, citing such a reference to simple-minded unwary and unlearned Sunnīs is the height of treachery, deception and shamelessness. The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah are aware that even if such a reference exists, it must be the handiwork of some deviant Shīʿah.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Islamic history

It does not seem that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has the potential to be so devious. Instead, this must be the mastery of some crooked soul, possessed by the devil. If one has to consider that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has actually attached the title of al-Rashīd to Ma'mūn, then he surely lacks the academic capability to stir such controversy.

Nevertheless, it is really despite his great proficiency that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is still confused about who actually bears the title, al-Rashīd; Is it Hārūn or Ma'mūn? You are so convinced about the Fadak Estate being unduly withheld from its rightful inheritor that it perhaps surpasses the conviction you have about the oneness of Allah and the Nubuwwah of the Prophet ﷺ. Similarly, you are so fanatical in your opposition to the Ahl al-Sunnah that you lose control of yourself.

So is there anyone to restrain ʿAmmār ʿAlī so that we could put all matters into perspective for him and there is much more which he is unaware of. Some of this is as follows:

The Fadak Estate was from Fay'

Firstly; the following verse which appears in Sūrah al-Ḥashr establishes that whether it is the question of the Fadak Estate or otherwise, all of this (booty) is unanimously classified as Fay', and the Prophet ﷺ did not have sole possession over it. Allah Taʿālā says:

مَّا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ رَسُولِهِ

And what Allah restored to His Messenger[1]

Therefore, it can be understood what category of *Hibah* (giving a gift) applies to the Fadak Estate if it is assumed that the narration of giving it to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is acceptable in the discussion relating to the inheritance of the Ambiyā'. This is a discussion on the ḥadīth:

لا نورث ما تركناه صدقة

We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from, whatever we leave behind is charity.[2]

In fact, it would be established with certainty that the narration of giving Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is baseless because this narration would be in conflict with the Qur'ān. Any narration that is in conflict with the Qur'ān is unanimously baseless.

Similarly, the reliable and popular references of the Ahl al-Sunnah contain narrations which are more explicit about Fadak not being given to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها than the dubious narrations of ʿAmmār ʿAlī from unknown sources about it being given to her. So who would be so foolish to discard authentic, transparent, and explicit narrations for the baseless fabrications recorded by ʿAmmār Ali? And who besides ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have faith in such fables?

If you are not convinced about this, consider the following authentic narrations regarding Fadak:

The history of the Fadak Estate in the first period of Islam

The following narration appears in *Mishkāt*, which is a very popular reference of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It contains a report which is transmitted by Imām Abū Dāwūd

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 6346.

on the authority of Mughīrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The report states that when ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Marwān became the khalīfah, he gathered the prominent members of the family of Marwān and made the following address to them:

> إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كانت له فدك فكان ينفق منها و يعود منها على صغير بني هاشم و يزوج منها أيمهم وإن فاطمة سألته أن يجعلها لها فأبى فكانت كذلك في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم حتى مضى لسبيله فلما ولي أبو بكر عمل فيها بما عمل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم في حياته حتى مضى لسبيله فلما ولي عمر بن الخطاب عمل فيها بمثل ما عملا حتى مضى لسبيله ثم اقتطعها مروان ثم صارت لعمر بن عبد العزيز فرأيت أمرا منعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة ليس لي بحق و إني أشهدكم أني رددتها على ما كانت يعني على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و أبي بكر و عمر
>
> The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ possessed Fadak. Therefrom would he spend, take care of the young of the Banū Hāshim, and get their spinsters married. Fāṭimah asked him to give it to her but he refused. It remained like this during the lifetime of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ until he passed on.
>
> After Abū Bakr was appointed khalīfah, he administered it just as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ administered it during his lifetime until he passed on.
>
> When ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb was appointed as khalīfah, he administered him just as they had until he passed on.
>
> Thereafter Marwan divided it. And now it has come into the possession of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. I felt that I do not have right over something the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ prevented Fāṭimah from. I therefore make you witness that I have returned it to what it was i.e. during the era of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Abū Bakr, and ʿUmar.[1]

This is the translation of the narration as it appears. However, someone with ʿAmmār Ali's academic credentials should not think that Marwān assumed possession of Fadak immediately after Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as the apparent wording of this narration suggests. Rather, this is a summary of the narration and it implies that

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, Ḥadīth: 2972.

Marwān was the first person who made a change in the status of the Fadak Estate when he assumed the khilāfah. Historians are unanimous that the Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also dealt with Fadak like his predecessors.

Firstly, the evidence that this narration has been shortened is found from the Arabic word *Aqṭaʿahā*. This word signifies that Marwān made it his personal possession and this could only be possible under his reign, which is apparent from the word for those who have any knowledge of Arabic. Naturally, this could only be the prerogative of the khalīfah. Secondly, if the narration must be accepted as is then it implies that Marwān assumed the post of the khalīfah immediately after Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he remained in this position until he was succeeded by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Anyone who is familiar with history knows that both of these facts are incorrect.

Nevertheless, the affairs of Fadak were then entrusted to Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, where after it was overseen by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which is unanimously agreed upon by Sunnī and Shīʿī scholars. When Marwān came along, he took it as his personal property and dealt with it as such. Marwān was succeeded by many Khulafā' until the matter of khilāfah came to ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

Brevity of this nature is a common occurrence and it occurs frequently in the Noble Qur'an too. Consider the stories of Sayyidunā Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Sayyidunā Mūsa عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

Nevertheless, the scholars, the historians, and Muḥaddithīn are unanimous that Fadak and other possessions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were overseen by Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Sayyidunā ʿAlī then enjoyed complete authority over it with the exclusion of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. After the demise of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, its matter was taken over by Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and then by Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It was then overseen by Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn and Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan. Finally, Zayd ibn Ḥasan—the brother of Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan—assumed control over its affairs and its returns were utilised according to them.

Having said this, it must be borne in mind that *Mishkāt* is a popular reference which is known to one and all and *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* is one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth. When a narration is recorded in such acclaimed and authentic references then its authenticity speaks for itself. Similarly, this narration is so explicit about

Fadak remaining in the possession of the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life and that the Prophet ﷺ withheld it from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها despite her request for it. This is similar to the manner in which a wise doctor or nurse forbids a patient from something on account of its detriment. The Prophet's ﷺ refusal to make over Fadak to the best of the Ahl al-Bayt is of this nature. (Why would the Prophet ﷺ not withhold it from her when the actual revelation of the following verse occurred after demands for material provisions were placed upon the Prophet ﷺ:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا

Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.[1]

The difference between Hibah and ʿAṭā'

Nevertheless, the above narration of *Mishkāt* clearly rejects the claim of Fadak being officially and exclusively given to Sayyidah Fāṭimah as a *Hibah* (gift). As for the Shīʿī narration which claims that it was given exclusively to her as a gift, it is not explicit in stating that it was a gift to her. This is because the Arabic term which appears in that narration, the translation of which has been provided by ʿAmmār ʿAlī is:

أعطاها

Gave to her.

The above word is general in its purport; it could refer to that which is regarded in the Sharʿī terminology as *Hibah* and it could also refer to loaning an item or giving temporary use thereof to someone. The evidence for this is that its translation in Urdu (and in English) is: to give something. Therefore, if the exclusive term of *Hibah* is not used, then concluding that Fadak was given to her cannot be established from ʿAmmār Ali's narration.

Now analyse these two reports; one appears in *Mishkāt* and the other is recorded in ʿAmmār's letter. Consider the authenticity, clarity and explicitness of the former against the weakness, ambiguity and lack of clarity of the other. Which narration

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

is weightier? Even ʿAmmār ʿAlī would conclude that the worthier and more acceptable narration is that which appears in *Mishkāt*, if he were rational and he applied common sense.

If by some impossible assumption the narration of *Hibah* of Fadak does appear in the references he recorded and the integrity, credibility and scholarship of its compilers is acceptable, and the word *Aʿaṭāhā* refers to *Hibah*, then too it would be said that these compilers gathered these narrations as a rough manuscript with the intention of distinguishing and sifting that which is valid from that which is baseless. This is the case with many compilers and authors. However, they either passed on before accomplishing their objective or they did not get time to deal with it. Therefore, many fabricated Shīʿī reports appear in their works and some people falter and err on account of being unaware of the true nature of events.

A word on these baseless narrations

We are able to provide testimony about this from the writings of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who was the greatest scholar of his era in the field of ḥadīth. He states the following in his *Tuḥfah*:

> The author of *Jāmiʿ al-Uṣūl* says that Khaṭīb Baghdādī—one of the latter Muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah—gathered the 'aḥādīth' of the Shīʿah from Sharīf Murtaḍā—who is one of greatest scholars of the Shīʿah—with the intention of assessing them for any traces of veracity.

Prior to this, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states that when the latter scholars of ḥadīth found that their predecessors had successfully gathered all *Ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and *Ḥasan* (sound) aḥādīth and there was no scope for additional research on this, they decided to direct their energies to those narrations which are either classified as *Ḍaʿīf* (weak), or a fabrication, or the text and chain of transmission of the ḥadīth has been distorted. They subsequently gathered all these narrations intending to assess them thoroughly and clarify their position and perhaps sift the content which is sound and established from that which is baseless. In many instances, they either passed on before accomplishing their task or they did not have the liberty of time to do so. However, this task was undertaken by scholars of ḥadīth who succeeded them. Ibn al-Jawzī—whom ʿAmmār ʿAlī refers to as well—is one such Muḥaddith. He has distinguished that which is fabricated from that which qualifies

to be classified as *Ḥasan li Ghayrihī*[1]. ʿAllāmah Suyūṭī had the same ambition when gathering reports in his *Tafsīr*, *al-Durr al-Manthūr*, and he explicitly states this in the introduction to his work. Summarised from *Tuḥfah*.

The Shīʿah take support from reports rejected by the Muḥaddithīn

It would be evident to the reader by now that the Sunnī references which ʿAmmār refers to are no more than compilations which record unacceptable and fabricated narrations in order to highlight their actual status. Shīʿī scholars narrate these reports whereas the reality is that the compiler may have only succeeded in gathering them, not scrutinising them and clarifying their status.

However, there is reference made to books such as *al-Durr al-Manthūr* and the books of Ibn al-Jawzī. If these books do contain narrations which the Shīʿah use in their arguments against the Ahl al-Sunnah, then the appearance of these reports is just like how *Tuḥfah*, *Muntaha al-Kalām*, and *Ṣawāqiʿ*, etc. record the (false) narration of Fadak being given to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا as Hibah. Who does not know that Tuḥfah does indeed record this narration but it classifies it as baseless at the same time.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī is very shrewd because (he records references wherein these narrations appear but he does not state that these authors actually rejected them, but) he does not make any reference to *Tuḥfah* or the compilations of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī (who also recorded these narrations and expressed its true status). Had he recorded these books he could have scored two extra points; firstly, his list of Sunnī references (in his favour) would be lengthier and his readership are well acquainted with these two personalities. The acquaintance which people have with Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī is greater than the acquaintance with the former scholars of Islam. Similarly, it is well-known that these two scholars played a great role in combating Shīʿism. Therefore, mentioning their references would not constitute a lie and the common Muslim would really be swayed by this thinking that if an acclaimed and world-renowned scholar like Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz has recorded these narrations then they must be acceptable.

However, since the books of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī and the *Tuḥfah* of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz are in Persian and there are many people who are well-versed in Persian, he

1 A terminology in ḥadīth verification.

apprehended that someone may actually get hold of these books and discover the actual reality.

Shame be upon this degree of integrity. If he wished to adopt fraud and deception as a profession, he could have used this skill for trivial material gains. Why blemish Islam and disfigure the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ? However, it is good that you intended to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah who are able to get rid of such frauds with utmost ease.

One could not predict what would be the fate of the Shīʿah if they were subjected to such fraud and deception. When their esteemed scholars cannot distinguish the reason why a particular narration appears in a particular reference—for justification or for rejection—then it is very possible that ʿAmmār ʿAlī may soon go on to say that (Allah forbid) Allah calls His Messenger a magician, one who has lost his sanity, and one who fabricates. It is not far-fetched that the blinded Shīʿah may embrace such a view not realising that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ quotes the words of the disbelievers in these instances for purposes of refuting it.

Nevertheless, no Muslim should be deceived by this shrewdness and cunningness. Many such Dajjāls have attempted to distort the true teachings of Islam and the actual beliefs of Muslims. In pretending to be learned and proficient scholars of Islam, their errors give ignorance a complete new dimension.

The reference of Al-Durr al-Manthūr

Thus far, we have briefly examined the credibility of this narration, regarding the gifting (Hibah) of the Fadak Estate to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, in the references recorded by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. However, it would be appropriate for us to elaborate on this issue and put the matter to rest once and for all.

However, since the reputation of the book *Al-Durr al-Manthūr* precedes itself and may leave one in doubt—let alone the common masses but even a few neophytes amidst the scholars—chiefly due to the reputation of the author, who carries the epithet of *Seal of the Muḥaddithīn and Termination of the Mufassirīn*, and his numerous literary works, particularly his completion of the famed commentary on the Qur'ān—*Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, which has reached universal fame. Thus, I thought it only appropriate to elucidate upon the credibility of this narration in light of his own literary works (as opposed to any other).

Therefore, I commence by saying that the appearance of this narration in *Al-Durr al-Manthūr* is irrelevant because the very purpose of this collection is to distinguish between authentic and forged narrations. So, let alone this particular narration, it has a host of fabrications besides it. But credit must be given to ʿAmmār ʿAlī for his brilliance and integrity for referring to such a text to support his argument against the Ahl al-Sunnah. If this is what deductions are all about and if this is the manner of establishing facts, then tomorrow he may just end up saying that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is the son of Allah because it appears as such in the Qur'ān (even if it may have been for the purpose of refuting this belief).

The explanation of Dhū al-Qurbā in Jalālayn and al-Itqān

If on account of the scarcity of *Tafsīr al-Durr al-Manthūr* one is hesitant upon accepting this, then he may refer to *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* or *al-Itqān* which have been published and are widely available in this part of the world. *Jalālayn* is the more prominent of the two as it is a fundamental to the study of tafsīr, just as *Mīzān al-Ṣarf* is to understanding Arabic grammar and etymology. So, let us see what explanation he has given to the word Dhū al-Qurbā and Ḥaqqahu which appears in the following verse:

وَأْتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right[1]

Had the contentious narration been valid according to him, he would not have hesitated to document it and clarify its status. Assuming that brevity was the primary objective of *Jalālayn* and he could not accommodate detailed reports in it, he could at least have recorded "Fāṭimah al-Zahrā" after Dhū al-Qurbā and the word "Fadak" after Ḥaqqahu. This is also the trend in *Jalālayn* that if the explanation of any verse or word is established from a ḥadīth, brief reference is made to it in the manner described above. In fact, references to ḥadīth texts are supplied at times too.

In addition to this, it can be established from *al-Itqān* that the contentious narration is a fabrication. This is because under discussion on Makkī and Madanī chapters,

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 26.

Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī classifies the chapters of the Qur'ān in two sections; those which are unanimously Makkī or Madanī, and those regarding which there is a difference of opinion about it being either Makkī or Madanī. As for Sūrah al-Rūm and Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl, it is unanimously agreed that they are Makkī and Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī transmits this report with some sound chains of transmission. Therefore, Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī establishes that there is no disagreement about them being Makkī.

Taking this discussion further, he then establishes which Makkī chapter has Madanī revelation and vice-versa. Once again, he establishes with sound transmission that there are no exceptions in the case of Sūrah al-Rūm and Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl; they are entirely Makkī.

Similarly, if some scholars have a different view about some of their verses being Madanī, the difference applies to verses besides the one in question. Therefore, there is no scope for contention regarding these specific verses and they are Makkī without a shadow of doubt.

We, thus, pronounce that *al-Itqān* establishes that these two chapters and the two verses in question are Makkī without any difference on this matter among the scholars throughout the ages.

It is somewhat bemusing that Shī'ī scholars are also in agreement on this fact. Consequently, we have already referred to the view of al-Ṭabarsī—author of *Majmaʿ al-Bayān*—that:

سورة الروم مكّية إلا قوله : فسبحان الله إلخ

> Sūrah al-Rūm is a Makkī Sūrah, with the exception of the verse: "So exalted is Allah when you reach the evening and when you reach the morning."

It is thus concluded from *al-Itqān* that the following verse is Makkī:

وَأٰتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right.[1]

Therefore, it is impossible that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام clarified the purport of this verse by saying that it refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and that she is the sole heir to the

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 26.

Fadak Estate. Such folly cannot be attributed to Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. Yes, if he subscribed it to the Shīʿī faith then such a folly could occur.

Further substantiation from al-Itqān

In the 69th section—which pertains to the qualifications of a Mufassir—Imām al-Suyūṭī states the following in his discussion on differences in the commentary of a verse:

> Tafsīr [of verses or words] which is transmitted with authentic transmission are but a few. As for that which is transmitted from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it is even less.

He then commits to record all reports containing authentic tafsīr in sequence. Commencing with the first sūrah, he proceeds till the end, recording all the authentic tafsīr reports along with its references; but the contentious report neither appears in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl nor Sūrah al-Zumar. At the end of this process he says:

> This is what is considered *Marfūʿ*[1] and which the scholars have considered to be marfūʿ. Despite it being marfūʿ, it is then either *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Ḥasan*[2], *Ḍaʿīf*, even *Mursal*[3] and *Muʿḍal*[4] at times. However, I have refrained from that which is baseless or fabricated.

Now taking his commitment into consideration, it implies that he was fully aware of what he has recorded and what he has omitted. Therefore, if the contentious narration does not appear, it means that it has been omitted intentionally and contemplatively. Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī classified is as baseless and fabricated, and accordingly discarded it. Had he even considered it ḍaʿīf, mursal or muʿḍal, he would have recorded it, which is the case with some of those narrations.

---

1 A *marfūʿ* ḥadīth is a narration elevated to Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This, as opposed to a mawqūf ḥadīth, which is a narration raised to a Ṣaḥābī, and a *maqṭūʿ* ḥadīth, which is attributed to a Tābiʿī.

2 *Ḥasan* is a term describing a ḥadīth that, while not meeting the isnād requirements to be ṣaḥīḥ, did not have flaws serious enough to be considered weak or enjoyed some form of bolstering corroboration.

3 A *mursal* ḥadīth is when a transmitter cites someone or the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ without actually having met him.

4 *Muʿḍal* (confusing/problematic) report can refer to a ḥadīth with an isnād that contains two or more missing consecutive links.

It is, thus, established that this contentious narration does not even enjoy the status of a ḍaʿīf narration in Sunnī references, nor is it transmitted with a chain that is ḍaʿīf. Therefore, saying that the Prophet ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها upon the revelation of this verse is a pure fabrication. Actually, Fadak remained in the Prophet's ﷺ possession till the end of his life, which has been established from authentic reports.

Sayyidunā ʿAlī's appointment over the Fadak Estate

If we were to overlook the issue of the validity of this narration for a moment, we have an argument in our favour—which is accepted in Shīʿī traditions too—and it relates to the manner in which Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه dealt with the Fadak Estate. Consequently, Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not distribute it to the heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها when he assumed control over it; instead he dealt with it in the same manner as his predecessors had dealt with it. He treaded the same course which the Prophet ﷺ, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ʿUmar, and Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم treaded upon, by distributing its returns among the destitute, the needy and the traveller. Assuming that the portion he distributed was that which he was entitled to, the question stills begs an answer: Why did he deprive the rest of the heirs of their lawful share of it?

The Shīʿah do not deny this fact and they have given four responses to it. I wish to record their responses to this question and clarify the issue so that the folly or fairness of Shīʿī scholars may become evident to one and all.

The first Shīʿī explanation

Their first response is that the Ahl al-Bayt always refrained from taking back that which was usurped from them. Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ did not assume possession of the home he left behind in Makkah after the polytheists took possession of it even after Makkah was conquered.

Our response

Firstly, it is difficult to establish the Prophet's ﷺ sole ownership over that house because his father passed away in the lifetime of his grandfather. Secondly, did the Prophet ﷺ inherit anything from his father? If it is said that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not resume possession of his home, it could be acceptable.

If we accept that the Prophet ﷺ did own the home because ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib bequeathed it to him, then we agree that the Prophet ﷺ did not take possession of it again after Makkah was conquered. But how can the Shīʿah establish the reason which they have offered as the actual reason why the Prophet ﷺ did not take it back? Consequently, there could be many reasons for not taking it back one of which is that one often forgives the thief or usurper for taking one's possessions. And forgiving the thief or usurper is only possible if one has the ability to reclaim possession. If one is unable to retrieve possession, then there is no meaning of forgiveness.

If what the Shīʿah say is valid then it was not permissible for Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to assume possession of his share of Fadak as the Ahl al-Bayt do not take back what was usurped from them. And if he did not assume possession of it on account of forgiving the usurpers, then he was only entitled to forgive them for taking his share, but he had no right over the shares of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما and their sisters رضي الله عنهن. And if the Ahl al-Bayt forgave the usurper then it implies that Fadak should have been left with those who usurped it and it would have remained in the custody of the usurpers' inheritors; it was not supposed to come back into the possession of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

The second possibility—which is the correct interpretation in this is case—is that when the enemy [disbelievers] gain dominance and authority over Muslims lands and there is none to challenge them regarding the rights of previously owned Muslim land or property, then such authority becomes lawful and legitimate for them. Since they have wrested control from the Muslims, they may now dispose those valuables as they please and they enjoy the right to do so. If they sell those possessions to someone, the purchaser secures lawful possession of it. This law has to be applied and understood in this manner otherwise the human race will be subjected to immense difficulty and everybody would then be branded as consumers of ḥarām.

International trade is inevitable and countries are dependent upon one another. If the disbelievers establish rule over a region, they would assume authority of its resources and their trade in those commodities would be legalised. If not, everybody's possession over these materials becomes dubious, questionable and contaminated. Therefore, Islam upholds this law in this situation.

The ʿUlamā' find the basis for this law in the noble Qur'ān too and the Prophet's ﷺ abstention from assuming possession over his home is based on this interpretation. However, if not assuming possession was on the basis of discarding possession of that which had been usurped, then this would be incorrect by the testimony of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and all the Shīʿah. Consequently, ʿAmmār's letter expressly states that Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما laid claim to Fadak during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه and even during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. So, if the Ahl al-Bayt do not reclaim that which was usurped then why did Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه claim it?

If they say that their claim to it is only recorded in Sunnī traditions and there is no justification of this claim in Shīʿī tradition, then we would say to them the Shīʿah cannot dispute that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr 'usurped' it and rejected Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim that it was given to her in the Prophet's ﷺ lifetime then she re-claimed it as her inheritance. Once again, if the Ahl al-Bayt do not re-claim what was usurped from them then why did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها do so?

If (being left dumbfounded by this) the Shīʿah irrationally assert that though these seem like two separate claims (the claim of it being given to her and the claim of it being her inheritance) it is actually one claim because it is *muttasil bi-lā faṣl*[1]. And since Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه refused to hand it over to her, it is established that it was usurped. However, it was not usurped when she laid claim to it initially. The usurpation only materialises after he refused to hand it to her.

We would respond by ignoring these silly statements and this would be a gesture of mercy from us. The fact that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها claimed it from him establishes that it was already usurped. It also establishes that their remark about the Ahl al-Bayt relinquishing ownership of that which was wrongfully taken from them is a fallacy.

However, since the level of their intelligence is evident, we would deal with this false notion by stating the following: Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رحمه الله assumed the rights to the Fadak Estate during the reign of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. It remained in his control until the ʿAbbāsid Khulafā' took control of it. Later in the year 22 A.H, Ma'mūn ʿAbbāsī wrote a letter to his governor, Qutham ibn Jaʿfar, that the Fadak Estate should be made over to the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It was

1 Occurring immediately in succession.

thus handed over to Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā'. Mutawakkil—the ʿAbbāsid khalīfah—then took control of it once again thereafter. Khalīfah Muʿtaḍid restored it once again during his reign. This report on the Fadak Estate has been documented in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, the Shīʿī scholar. Had it been written by any Sunnī scholar it would have had no credibility.

Let us dismiss this report from *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* for a moment because scholars are aware of the reality of this book and let us look at this fallacy from another perspective. Consider that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ accepted the post of the khalīfah after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, whereas the post of khilāfah was something that he was legitimately entitled to and it was snatched from him by the first three Khulafā'; why did he take back that which was snatched from him? Similarly, why was Imām Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ desirous of wresting control over the khilāfah from Yazīd (if the Ahl al-Bayt relinquishes rights over that which was wrongfully taken from them?) In fact, his endeavours for it led to his death.

If none of the above events (which establish the falsity of the Shīʿī claim) occurred then too there is no dispute among those who have knowledge about the permissibility of taking back what was wrongfully snatched from one, as well as the obligation upon one and all to help restore the rights of the actual owner to what was usurped from him. Consequently, if the verse, "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā their right,*" is a direct address to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ regarding the rights of his relatives specifically, then restoring their rights is an obligation which rests upon all those in authority. In addition to this, the Qur'ānic injunctions regarding justice and fairness are recorded repeatedly. Therefore, if the actual owner's rights are still established in that which was snatched from him then it was obligatory upon Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to give the heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا their dues when he assumed control of Fadak. But if they relinquish their rights and wilfully give up possession of that which was usurped from them then why is there all this criticism against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The second Shīʿī explanation

A second explanation—given by Shīʿī scholars—for Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not assuming authoritative control over Fadak is that he opted to follow the course taken by Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا in this matter. Therefore, he did not enjoy any benefits from it just as she did not benefit from it.

Our response

What a marvellous explanation from the Shīʿah! One cannot fail to be bemused by such cunningness. Nevertheless, it is such a flimsy response that the response to it is self-explanatory to those who have understanding. One's intelligence digests this response just as how the stomach was to inevitably digest a fly if circumstances warranted that.

However, since everyone is not on the same level of understanding we would say that why did the subsequent Imāms assume authoritative control over Fadak later on, as Qāḍī Nūr Allāh has clearly expressed? Why did they not follow in the blessed footsteps of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا or even Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for that matter? Similarly, was it incumbent or optional for them to follow Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا? If it was incumbent then why did the remaining Imāms not comply? If it was optional then—them being such glorious Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt—it begs the question why they discarded such a meritorious optional deed which was not only the precedent set by Sayyidah Fāṭimah and Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, but also by Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ? Consequently, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا found herself in a position where she could not benefit from Fadak, which was also the situation of the above-mentioned personalities.

Secondly, we respond to this explanation by asking why did Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ neglect his obligations to the remaining heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا if he so ceremoniously opted to tread on the path she went on in the case of Fadak?

Thirdly, *Iqtidā'*—which refers to following someone—applies only in that which they did by choice and free will. In no way does it govern such actions of the one who is followed which were carried out against their will, or in which they were victims of circumstances. If so, it would compel Imām al-Mahdī to adopt the ominous Taqiyyah which his predecessors were compelled to adopt due to the circumstances they found themselves in. Similarly, it would have obligated Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to follow Sayyidunā ʿAlī (and adopt Taqiyyah instead of sacrificing his life).

Therefore, if Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was unable to benefit from Fadak, it was due to the circumstance she found herself in. It is baseless if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fails to exert his authority during his reign as the khalīfah and instead opt to follow her. He may be justified in relinquishing his rights but what about negligence and

failure to hand over the inheritance of Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, and their sister رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?

The third Shīʿī explanation

A third explanation provided by Shīʿī scholars is that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not derive any benefit from Fadak simply to prove and establish that his testimony in this regard was purely for the sake of Allah; not for any personal gain.

Our response

This response also lacks substance like those preceding it. Those who allegedly doubted the integrity of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in this matter were the very same people who rejected his evidence and they had already left this world when he assumed the role of the khalīfah. Making a statement in this manner after their demise lacks sense and sensibility. It certainly would not leave any impression upon the dead since they cannot witness it. Similarly, their deaths would have already unveiled the reality of their stance upon them and they would have known conclusively that they were the oppressors and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was innocent. Therefore, failing to benefit from Fadak was pointless; Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ discarded lawful wealth and did not benefit from it by utilising it either for worldly causes or acquiring the rewards of the hereafter.

It could rightly be said that whilst the first three Khulafā' were no longer alive, their sympathisers were still in large numbers, not forgetting the Nawāṣib—the enemies of Sayyidunā ʿAlī. The answer to this is that this very suspicion against Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for his testimony recurs when some of his descendants assumed control over Fadak later on, and more specifically in the era of Ma'mūn—who was sympathetic to the Shīʿī cause and who handed over Fadak to Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā, as he maintained that they enjoyed sole rights over Fadak.

Would not his descendants assuming control over it stir the same sentiments within the Nawāṣib? After all, ancestors are known for having long-term ambitions for their progenies and for striving to secure their prosperity. The notorious Nawāṣib—in judging others by their own standards—would inevitably suspect Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of impure intentions for his testimony. Perhaps he realised that he would not have control over Fadak but his testimony could bear fruits someday for his progeny.

Therefore, if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was prompted by the desire to avert suspicion and misconduct, then he ought to have made a bequest to his progeny to also refrain from profiting from Fadak, lest it gives reasons for some to cast aspersions against his character.

The fourth Shīʿī explanation

The fourth explanation is that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was adopting Taqiyyah by not assuming control over Fadak.

Our response

Since every ploy has failed, they have inevitable resorted to their devious tenet of Taqiyyah. However, it is commonly said that a liar has a very poor memory. Consequently, they have forgotten that when the Imām is equipped, prepared, and occupied with jihād then Taqiyyah becomes ḥarām upon him. This is the reason why Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not adopt Taqiyyah at all. Therefore, if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ adopted Taqiyyah during his reign as the khalīfah, then he has perpetrated a ḥarām act.

A wise enemy is better than a foolish friend.

It seems that in trying to rescue Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they have implicated him further.

To answer this, we ask: who was he adopting Taqiyyah from? If it is the three Khulafā', then they were no longer on the scene and even a coward does not fear his dead enemy let alone ʿAlī —the Lion of Allah.

If he was adopting Taqiyyah—and sparing his life—from the rest of the people, then they also fall in one of two categories. The first group comprises of his supporters and his army whilst the rest of his subjects fall in the second category. If Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ faced such a threat from his subjects then such confrontation could only come from the less-fortunate and under-privileged class, which compromises of the poor, the destitute, and the travellers. So, adopting Taqiyyah out of fear for them is also the lowest form of cowardice. Who else would have any motivation for challenging Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ whilst in his role as the khalīfah over Fadak?

Assuming that the threat of confrontation was genuine, who are the ones who had the valour and bravery of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and a formidable army to achieve

this end? The only possible suspects could be Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah or Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. Did they not attempt and fail? Even if his taking control over Fadak led to any such uprising or revolt, its implications would be minimal. Such attempts seldom bear fruit.

Consider the situation of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ against the backdrop of the situation that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ faced. When he assumed the khilāfah, it was only the Arabian Peninsula that was under the sway of Islam and the departure of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ led to an immediate revolt from multiple quarters at the same time. Besides being left only with the people of Makkah and Madinah at his side, a substantial chunk of the fighting force had been despatched on a mission with Usāmah ibn Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. But Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was fearless. When some of the Ṣaḥābah were apprehensive of confronting the rejecters of zakāh, he said:

> By the oath of Allah, if they withhold from me even a rope which they used discharge as zakāh I will wage war against them.

In fact, he also said that he would face them all by himself if no one supported his decision. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was prepared to wage war all by himself at such a critical juncture for them withholding something as trivial as a rope, then Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was most renowned for his valour and bravery. In addition to this, he had a formidable army comprising many villains who had successfully brought down an established regime. Similarly, whilst Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was prepared to wage war for a trivial rejection—a rope—ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have been fighting for the prized Fadak, which was also oppressively withheld from the innocent Ahl al-Bayt, so what prevented him from taking control and instead opted for Taqiyyah?

Nevertheless, the futility and baselessness of their arguments is evident. They have failed miserably to support their stance. If anything, it has strengthened the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who maintain that he did not assume control over Fadak and retained its previous status. This is simply because the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not give Fadak to anyone and because the estate of the Ambiyā' cannot be inherited. Allah willing, this matter—the estate of the Ambiyā'—will be elaborated upon soon.

Therefore, now that we have established our stance, it becomes evident to one and all that the contentious narration, which is the very basis of their belief of Fadak being usurped, lacks all credibility. It is nothing but a fabrication, concocted by Shīʿī

scholars. It is merely a farce, failing the requirements for credible transmission (*riwāyah*) and objectionable in content, thereby failing the requirements of dirāyah.

The same applies for the fancy fairy-tale type report regarding Ma'mūn ʿAbbāsī gathering two hundred scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah after the progeny of Ḥasanayn[1] laid claims to Fadak. If this report is not entirely false, then it is also not entirely accurate. There is evidence that Ma'mūn did hand over Fadak to the illustrious progeny of Ḥasanayn on account of his sympathy to Shīʿī tenets.

Nevertheless, since these tales are established fallacies it becomes clear that the allegation of usurping Fadak after it was gifted to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, and which ʿAmmār has been vociferously alleging is nothing more than a figment of his imagination. It is not necessary for us to prove its baselessness any longer. This much is conclusive evidence and Shīʿī scholars are deafeningly silent in their response to this.

Does the narration of Sayyidah Fāṭimah claiming Fadak was gifted to her occur in Sunnī traditions?

However, according to the principles of debate, taking the challenge of responding to something that is not necessary is recognised as a sign of one's authenticity and it further justifies one's stance. Consequently, the narration that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا claimed Fadak was gifted to her does not even appear with a weak chain of transmission in the reliable references of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This narration alleges that she did lay claim to it, whereupon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ requested her to provide witnesses to support her claim. She subsequently presented Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Umm Ayman, or Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ—according to the different versions—but Sayyidunā Abū Bakr rejected the claim since the testimonies were inadequate, as the minimum requirement is one male and two females.

This entire report is a fabrication of the 'learned' Shīʿī scholars, and in fabricating this report they have made themselves eligible to enter the fire of Jahannam and dwell in doom forever. What audacity! Having forged the narration, they present it as evidence and demand answers from the Ahl al-Sunnah for its contents.

---

1 Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.

We would like to bring it to the attention of the sincere Muslim that it has never been a trait of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah to resort to lies and Taqiyyah in order to avoid a sticky situation. If Sunnī scholars had access to the backdoor of Taqiyyah, they would have avoided many problems. However, they chose to report everything and narrate the facts as they are. This is why Sunnī references quote the incident when Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا requested inheritance and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ declined (and this much of the report is valid). They also record the *Incident of Qirṭās* and the Battle of Jamal, as these are realities which cannot be wished away. If lying was permissible, then they could have also refuted their authentic narrations just as Shīʿī scholars often tend to do.

Despite this integrity, look at the level to which Shīʿī scholars have stooped, simply because of their enmity for the Ahl al-Sunnah, and due to their jealousy for the pristine pure dīn that the we have. Subsequently, they forged narrations and made these fabrications the basis of contention between the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah. Surely lying and deceit is so inherent within them that it can only be lies and forgeries which give them satisfaction, and since this is their devious nature—just to please them—we will also say that sure, whatever they say is true and correct.

Two evidences establishing the baselessness of the report of gifting Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah

Out of consideration for the people of truth, I would record two evidences establishing that their report is incorrect, so that they can be completely convinced and have no reservations. One evidence would be from the Ahl- al-Sunnah and the other from the Shīʿah. The evidence of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the report from *Mishkāt*—which has been cited earlier on—which records that ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ dealt with Fadak as his predecessors had dealt with it.

We have highlighted the authenticity and veracity of this report earlier on. *Mishkāt* is a renowned book of ḥadīth and this particular narration is recorded therein from *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth.

Nevertheless, this is an authentic narration in Sunnī references. Therefore, any report in conflict with it, especially when its chain of transmission and its reference falls well below the standard of the report contained in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, cannot be considered true and accurate.

Therefore, if anyone goes on to claim that Sunnī references contain the narration of Fadak being gifted to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then every Muslim should know that this is a false allegation. And if it does appear in any Sunnī resource, it appears for the sake of refuting its validity and dismissing it as inaccurate. Or perhaps it was added to that reference by mischief makers, or the author collected all types of reports with the intention of scanning and assessing them but he could not accomplish his goal and the task was left incomplete. Shīʿī scholars then cunningly sourced the narration from the Sunnī reference and use it as evidence.

The second evidence is from the Shīʿah, which would further implicate them and silence them, which is the fact that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also retained Fadak as it was previously, by distributing its benefits to the poor, the destitute and the travellers. Similarly, he neither benefited from it personally nor distributed the legitimate shares of the Ahl al-Bayt, whom the Shīʿah revere so highly. The Shīʿah cannot deny the reality that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ dealt with Fadak in this manner and we have already elaborated on this. Though they have strived to challenge this, they have failed miserably. This fact remains uncontested and both sides have no option but to accept it and this along with the narration of *Mishkāt* adequately establishes that the narration that Fadak was given to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is invalid.

When there is no basis to this report then why did they go on to say that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—the infallible daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ according to them but rather protected according the Ahl al-Sunnah—went on to make false claims and also made Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ give blatantly false testimony, which is akin to disbelief.

Nevertheless, this narration finds no expression in Sunnī references, it is a fabrication of the Shīʿah. It is then the high of folly and stupidity to make their own fabrication a point of contention between us and them and seek clarification or demand an explanation from us.

As for the remaining nine or ten references ʿAmmār ʿAlī records, it is nothing more than an old trick which has been transmitted to him from heart to heart by his predecessors. We have given the response to this quoting from *Tuḥfah* of Shah ʿAbd al ʿAzīz that Shīʿī scholars trick people by making reference to rare books, the names of which are unfamiliar, and then alleging that these reports are to be found in them. However, these books are free of such reports and if one or two odd

manuscripts of these rare books contain such a report, then these manuscripts have been forged by their scholars. *Tuḥfah* has highlighted this scheme in detail.

But if all the manuscripts of a rare book concur in relation to such a report then it must be determined whether the author set out to record authentic reports only or was it his aim to gather all reports randomly. Consequently, the latter is true. Accordingly, in his treatise on the principles of ḥadīth, Shah ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq has written that Imām Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī has collected narrations from approximately fifty books in his *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*, and he has recorded all narrations therein irrespective of its classification as ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf or ḥasan. This is the case with other references and authors too.

Since the objective was collecting reports in general these books have not been given the prominence which authentic books enjoy. Had the compilers intended to put forth authentic transmissions only, their works would have been recognised as the authentic works are recognised.

Even if we assume that these compilers intended to collect authentic narrations only, then too the classification of the status of a ḥadīth does not depend entirely on the views of one scholar only, according to the academic traditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In matters of this nature, whilst it is not necessary that the Muḥaddithīn would have unanimity on the issue, but a significant majority of ḥadīth experts being in agreement on its classification is vital. Anyone can understand that this process of clarification and authorisation is vital.

In addition to this, many Shīʿī scholars hid under the cloak of Taqiyyah and then went on to gain the confidence of people after spending considerable time with Sunnī Muḥaddithīn. They then narrated the aḥādīth of those scholars and also transmitted their fabrications through the same chain of transmission. Since they seemed noble and righteous outwardly and they had recourse to Taqiyyah, they succeeded in transmitting their fictitious reports through established lines of transmission. Many simple-minded, albeit credible scholars, accepted their narrations on the basis of harbouring good thoughts for fellow Muslims and since they seemed righteous and they were transmitting these ‘facts’ from credible teachers. Thus, they were deceived.

The greatest treachery of the Shīʿah under the guise of Taqiyyah

However, the scholars who came later on realised this trick and unveiled the masked villains and declared their transmissions to be fabrications. Consequently, Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states the following in *Tuḥfah*, whilst dealing with the cunningness of the Shīʿah:

> The fifteenth ploy is that a group amongst the Shīʿī scholars impersonated Sunnī scholars of ḥadīth and dedicated themselves to ḥadīth acquisition. They attended the gatherings of credible Muḥaddithīn and captured their respective credible chains of transmission. They then adopted the ways of the righteous and pious ones thereby winning the confidence of the next generation of ḥadīth seekers. They then transmitted their valid narrations and succeeded in transmitting their distortions too.
>
> This treachery of the Shīʿī scholars beguiled many scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. What could be said about the general masses then. This is because the capacity to distinguish between a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth and concocted narrations is the specialised field of those who have mastery over the science of isnād. Since this treachery was a breach which surpassed the chain of transmission, the scope for detection was dramatically reduced, if not lost all together.
>
> However, since the knowledge of the Ahl al-Sunnah has been assured divine protection, the scholars of isnād were alerted at once and they discovered it and exposed it for what it really was. Subsequently, when the matter was resolved then Shīʿī scholars acknowledged committing these forgeries.
>
> Some of them denied the allegation but there is a certain common feature in these narrations by which they can be sniffed out. These narrations are preserved to this day in the various *Maʿājim*, *Muṣannafāt*, and *Ajzā'*. Most of those who maintain that ʿAlī was superior—to all three Khulafā' or to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only, i.e. Tafḍīliyyah—as well as those who have Shīʿī inclinations tend to take support from these particular narrations.
>
> The first person who was found guilty of this offence was Jābir al-Juʿfī. When he was exposed, Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim declared him unworthy and rejected all narrations from him as a precaution. Imām al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasa'ī, and Abū Dāwūd accepted those of his narrations wherein some other credible narrator corroborated what he had transmitted. As for the rest of these narrations, they were discarded.

> Abū al-Qāsim Saʿd ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ubayy ibn Khalf al-Qummī was another notorious character, skilled at the art of distortion. Many of those who lack insight into the science of isnād consider him to be one of our credible transmitters of ḥadīth, which is incorrect. Al-Najāshī—an authority of Shīʿī reporters—states that this person is the pride of Shīʿī scholars and their most prominent jurist and scholar.

The above exposition by Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is worth its weight in gold. His proficiency in knowledge and in history is uncontested by both sides. Let alone his proficiency and distinction as a Sunnī scholar, he enjoys unparalleled insight about Shīʿism, which even Shīʿī scholars were envious of. *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* is glowing evidence of this.

Even if these words were not from Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and it were said by someone else, then too it would not be difficult to accept it considering that it is consistent with the idiosyncrasies of the Shīʿah and their ominous Taqiyyah would actually obligate them to go to these lengths.

Lisān al-Mīzān exposes some of these fraudsters

It appears from the declaration of *Lisān al-Mīzān* that many Shīʿī scholars were guilty of this. One of them is Ḥārith ibn Ghasīn, who actually transmits from Aʿmash رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. Ḥārith ibn Muḥammad Maʿkūf is another such narrator, as well as Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Zakariyyā ibn Ṣāliḥ Abū Saʿīd ʿAdawī al-Miṣrī. The latter would transmit fictitious reports by ascribing it to credible chains of transmission.

Nevertheless, how long are we going to keep our tongues moist with the praises of the great Shīʿī scholars, even one such example is excessive.

In case some simple-minded Muslim finds this exposition appalling, we would like to refer to the following verse of the Qur'ān, which highlights this mischief of the Shīʿah, and it almost seems as if its contents apply to them more than anyone else:

وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَىٰ عَلَى اللَّهِ الْكَذِبَ

And who is more unjust than one who invents about Allah untruths.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 7.

It is evident from this verse that there are those who conspire and scheme in order to create turmoil and strife, and to deceive and mislead simple-minded people. None have excelled the Shīʿah at this and why should this be surprising when deceit is the most fundamental tenet of their religion. Who else would speak lies if they do not? Actually, they have surpassed all limits in this aspect.

Therefore, if their dubious narration of Fadak has found its way in some Sunnī books, it is purely due to the deceit which the Ahl al-Sunnah were victims of on account of having good thoughts about those who hid behind the garb of Taqiyyah. Whilst the Muḥaqqiqīn unveiled this evil and publicised it, there efforts were not completely successful because it is impossible to recall a word once it has left the lips, just as the arrow that leaves the bow cannot return.

Inevitably the false narrations gained publicity and spread with rapid momentum, stirring confusion in the minds of the unwary and leading those who had inclinations to Shīʿī beliefs and the *Tafḍīli's*[1] to misguidance and deviation. These distortions led to misguidance just as the distortions of the Torah and Injīl led people astray.

However, with the revelation of the Qur'ān these distortions were rectified and the light of guidance shown once again for those who were groping in darkness. Similarly, authentic narrations and the research of the Muḥaqqiqīn scholars rectified these distortions. Whoever had the capacity to embrace guidance embraced it, whilst those whose potential was inherently evil, remained astray.

So it is not far-fetched if ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the likes of him fail to accept reform and prefer to stubbornly conform to the misguidances of their deviant predecessors. They are like those whose hearts were sealed so that the truth of the Qur'ān failed to penetrate it. So ʿAmmār ʿAlī is just like them as birds of a feather flock together. How true is the statement:

مَنْ يُضْلِلْ اللّٰهُ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ

Whoever Allah sends astray, there is no guide for him.[2]

---

1 Those who were of the opinion that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ was the most superior of all the Ṣaḥābah, while still maintaining respect and admiration for all the other Ṣaḥābah.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 186.

One step lower

For arguments sake, let us accept that the Shīʿī report regarding the gifting of Fadak is correct, then too it does not achieve the aims of the Shīʿah.

This is because if their narration is *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), our narration which appears in *Mishkāt* is *aṣaḥ* (most authentic). If their narration is strong, ours is stronger. Therefore, their narration cannot have preference over ours.

In case this logic of the stronger being preferred to the strong and the more authentic dominating authentic does not appeal to you, then this is the standard which all human beings apply equally all the time. But logic does not appeal to the Shīʿah, because if logic appealed to them, they would have to forsake their faith and they are in bliss upon their devious path. They are bent on differing and the differences found within them are unlike any other. Those who have seen the *Tuḥfah*, *Muntahā al-Kalām*, and other compilations of Ḥaydar ʿAlī would attest to this. Our treatise has also exposed some of these differences in a small way.

In fact, we do not have to go too far away. Have we not read that ʿAmmār ʿAlī maintains that the Prophet ﷺ had one daughter only, whereas al-Kulaynī and *Nahj al-Balāghah* clearly confirm otherwise, let alone the plural of daughters appearing in the Qur'ān regarding the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ.

We would now like to ask ʿAmmār ʿAlī (to resolve this issue)—although he is lying, but asserts to be truthful and his followers have no alternative but to follow him in this matter—why he considers his narration to be authentic whereas *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī is the most authentic Shīʿī reference and *Nahj al-Balāghah* is almost like divine revelation, and the Qur'ān is nothing but divine revelation (and all these contradict his report)? So probably he would say that the Qur'ān is incorrect as Allah is a victim of Badā', whilst *al-Kāfī* and *Nahj al-Balāghah* record the statements of the Imāms, whose knowledge comes from Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ and since Allah is prone to Badā', the same possibility arises once again. So, you—who has now broken all links between yourself and Allah and His Rasūl (due to Badā'), on what basis have you given preference to your narration about the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ over the testimony of Allah and the statements of *al-Kāfī* and *Nahj*? Do you consider yourself right in giving preference in this manner or not? If you consider yourself right, then that is exactly what we are saying that all human

beings give preference to more authentic facts over authentic facts, to stronger reports over strong ones. Otherwise you have to admit that your report is incorrect.

For those who believe that the less-authentic gains preference over the more-authentic, we will falsify this logic with the following words of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

> الزموا السواد الاعظم فان يد الله على الجماعة و اياكم و الفرقة فان الشاذ من الناس للشيطان كما ان الشاذ من الغنم للذئب
>
> Follow the greater majority because the hand of Allah is with the group and avoid differing because the one who splits and is all by himself is vulnerable to Shayṭān just as the lone sheep is more vulnerable to the wolf.

Based on the above, if we accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's narration about one daughter only is correct and authentic at most, then in giving preference to this authentic narration we would be differing with the whole world on this issue and it would result in us being the victims of Shayṭān. So, all the best to ʿAmmār ʿAlī if that is what he wishes for himself.

It seems as if Allah has created the Shīʿah for being examples of steadfastness upon misguidance, since they do not desist despite such overwhelming evidence. Just like how the sunlight is of no benefit to the blind, these blind-hearted one's cannot benefit from the light of guidance.

Therefore, only that person can doubt the preference of the narration of *Mishkāt* who doubts whether it is day when the sun is shining brightly.

The gifting of Fadak is not established even if their narration is considered authentic

Even if they do not wish to accept, we must proceed, as we need to establish the truth. So, let us assume that their invalid report is authentic and let us then assume that despite being less-authentic, it has to be given preference over the more authentic narration of *Mishkāt*, then too lies will ultimately fail and the Shīʿah objective cannot be accomplished. This is because this devious narration which found its way in some unknown and unheard of Sunnī references does not contain any such word whereby gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا can be established. Instead,

the word "*aʿṭā*" appears which equally denotes borrowing and gifting. To convince the reader, I will record the narration as it is.

Al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah—which has been written by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī in refutation of Shīʿī beliefs—contains the following concocted report of the Shīʿah, whereby they actually intended to criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but actually praised him on account of his good-fortune. And even though it praises him, it will still appear as condemnation only for ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his likes. The narration is as follows:

> وأخرج الحافظ عمر بن شبة أن زيدا هذا الإمام الجليل قيل له إن أبا بكر انتزع من فاطمة فدك فقال إنه كان رحيما وكان يكره أن يغير شيئا تركه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأتته فاطمة رضي الله عنها فقالت له إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أعطاني فدك فقال هل لك بينة فشهد لها علي وأم أيمن فقال لها فبرجل وامرأة تستحقيها ثم قال زيد والله لو رجع الأمر فيها إلي لقضيت بقضاء أبي بكر رضي الله عنه
>
> Ḥāfiẓ ʿUmar ibn Shabbah transmits from Zayd—the illustrious Imām (the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn)—that someone said to him that Abū Bakr had snatched Fadak from Fāṭimah, whereupon he said, "Abū Bakr was extremely compassionate (so how would he do something like that). (Actually) He disliked changing something that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had done. So, Fāṭimah came to him and said that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had given her Fadak. He asked: "Do you have any witness?" So ʿAlī and Umm Ayman testified. He said, "A decision cannot be made with the testimony of one male and one female." Zayd then said, "By the oath of Allah, if this matter was brought to me, I would pass judgement according to the judgement of Abū Bakr."

Now examine this report closely, despite it being a fabrication of outwardly righteous and inwardly impure people hiding in the garb of Taqiyyah, it has no mention of the Hibah of Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. It miraculously contains certain truths too, but the actual term that was vital to establish her ownership eluded them. Consider also the glowing tribute paid to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by this illustrious Imām, who is after all the son of the 'infallible' Imām.

Nevertheless, we were saying that even if this narration is free from every other defect and we equate it to the narration of *Mishkāt*, then too the ownership of

Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا cannot be determined. If this narration is legitimate then we would say that Sayyidunā Zayd's response to them is classified as *Mumashāt ma ʿal-Khaṣm*[1], that if we were to accept that it was taken then it was because of such and such reason. Nevertheless, it is obvious that it does not prove Hibah in any way.

The fact that ʿAṭā' denotes gifting and borrowing as established from a popular Ḥadīth

The word ʿAṭā' or Aʿṭā translates as giving in English. It refers equally to Hibah—which is giving permanent ownership—as well as borrowing or allowing temporary benefit. The justification for this is found in an authentic ḥadīth unanimously agreed upon by both sides, which is as follows:

> أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال يوم خيبر لأعطين هذه الراية غدا رجلا يفتح الله على يديه ، يحب الله ورسوله ، ويحبه الله ورسوله
>
> A day prior to handing over the flag to Sayyidunā ʿAlī for the battle of Khaybar, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, "I will give the banner tomorrow to a person who loves Allah and His Rasūl and he is also beloved to Allah and His Rasūl."

Now consider the word *aʿṭā* which appears here; no one claims that it suggests giving permanent ownership—i.e. Hibah—to Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Instead, it denotes a temporary appointment and an *amānah* (trust) which has time constraints and it can be revoked or discontinued at any time. If a King appoints someone as the minister, or if he keeps someone in charge of his treasury and hands the keys over to them, it signifies that they have a temporary appointment, which can be discontinued at any time and they have been placed in a position of amānah.

The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was in the position of a general in all the battles he fought and handing over any assignment or task to any soldier by giving the banner to him was also a position of trust no different from any of the above instances.

Since it is evident from the above that ʿaṭā' and aʿṭā' could also denote giving as an amānah, it could also imply that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا said that Fadak had been given to her in the lifetime of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, she actually meant that she was allowed to benefit from its profits only as an amānah, and whilst she does not consider it to be her sole property, she merely requested that she be allowed

1 Hypothetically agreeing with the plaintiff.

to continue benefiting from its revenue after his demise and that it should not be disposed off to the poor, destitute, and wayfarer like the rest of the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions.

As for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه requesting evidence and testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها (despite him being extremely merciful according to the declaration of Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله and extremely merciful people cannot be so hard-hearted, especially towards Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها as mercy to her is incumbent more than ever on account of the mercy her father showed humanity) it should be put into its proper context. Therefore, it is probable that the Prophet ﷺ did allow Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to benefit from the revenue of Fadak just before his demise and that this may have occurred without Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه having any knowledge of it as he had always known the Prophet ﷺ to have sole authoritative rights over it. As a result of this, Fadak ought to be disposed as the remaining possessions of the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, when Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها laid claim to its revenue all of a sudden, he found himself in a predicament. Pleasing Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was a crucial matter, but more so was following the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ regarding which Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله said, "That he disliked doing anything contrary to the manner in which the Prophet ﷺ did."

He was thus obligated to consider both dimensions. As for consideration for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, this obligation also stems from the compulsion to follow and obey the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, whilst there is great emphasis on fulfilling the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt, it ultimately cannot surpass the obligation of complying with the ways and manner of the Prophet ﷺ. Consequently, the verse which prohibits saying "'uff" or its kind to one's parents is not restricted to this utterance and it implies that the utterance of that which is worse than this is far more heinous.

Therefore, just as we would not displease the Prophet ﷺ in religious matters, we would consider it equally necessary to follow his directives in matters relating to the hereafter. This is because the actual purpose of sending the Messenger ﷺ is to rectify our religious affairs and our matters of the life of the hereafter. In the case of Fadak, which was a monetary obligation—in (handing over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah) there was a possibility of violating the practice of the Prophet ﷺ as he distributed its revenue to the poor, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

But since Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ—in this delicate situation—could not fully accede nor could he openly reject her claim, he sincerely opted for a route whereby he could pacify her feelings too without compromising the truth at the same time. He, thus, asked her for witnesses so that perhaps her claim could be established that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had given special concession to her to benefit from its revenue whilst it retained its actual status of being a general Waqf. Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was reluctant to refuse blatantly on account of the relationship to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and at the same time he did openly express that he would continue to execute its affairs as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (which is what he was bound to do).

Therefore, Allah provided a solution whereby Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would also not harbour bitter feelings. Consequently, she was unable to satisfy the legal requirement of witnesses, which absolves Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of satisfying her wishes without implicating him in any way. Therefore, he had a legitimate excuse and noble people—among whom Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is the noblest—whole-heartedly accept the excuse of one who is not guilty of shortcoming. Even if his noble action—of requesting witnesses—does not extol his greatness, it certainly removes any ill-feeling from the heart of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا towards him (as he was just doing what he was obligated to).

Therefore, Sayyidah Fāṭimah was ultimately pleased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which will soon be recorded from Shīʿī references. Similarly, the declaration by Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ that he would pass the same verdict of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also proves that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not grieved by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ decision. If she was grieved initially, this was ultimately resolved and the matter was settled harmoniously. Had she left this world displeased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, not one of the Ahl al-Bayt would have paid glowing tribute to him as is the case with this narration of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

Therefore, if the Shīʿī scholars accept that this report is a fabrication then that would be good. But if they consider it a legitimate report then too, it does not record anything contentious or incorrect, which should give them any reason to argue with the Ahl al-Sunnah. But if they cannot understand the above explanation then what can they understand after all?

A failed attempt to establish that Aʿṭā' denotes Hibah

It is possible that they endeavour to twist the matter once again by saying that aʿṭā' does denote temporary use or borrowing, but its actual (and true) meaning is not that and there must be some factor which necessitates this particular connotation. In the absence of such a factor, temporary usage cannot be determined as the implication of aʿṭā'.

We reject this altogether and condemn them for making claims without providing substantiation. Therefore, this claim is discarded.

If they are not pleased with this retort then just as they present an unjustified report and quarrel with the Ahl al-Sunnah because of that, we would also respond by presenting a completely unsubstantiated claim by saying that aʿṭā' equally denotes both meanings and both meanings can be expressed by the word aʿṭā'.

Actually, what they are saying is not completely incorrect. A word must imply what it has been coined for unless there are circumstances which warrant otherwise. Consequently, there must be additional factors preferring one meaning over the other. However, it is not necessary for such a motivating factor to be a verbal statement. Similarly, the need for a motivating factor is evident since it would prevent the person from misunderstandings and errors. Therefore, it is probable that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ assessed the material possessions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ upon assuming the khilāfah. He then assessed the situation of Fadak and concluded that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ enjoyed sole authority over it till the end, which has also been confirmed by the admission of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and other members of the Ahl al-Bayt, and they knew better as they are the immediate family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ subsequently decided to handle its affairs personally, but Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا intervened and informed him that (the benefits of) Fadak were given to her by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Therefore, though they do not have ownership, they should be entitled to retain its revenue.

Based on what he knew about Fadak, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ thus understood that aʿṭā' denotes temporary benefit and use, not permanent ownership. Similarly, the manner in which she asked for Fadak also establishes that aʿṭā' denotes temporary utilisation. Similarly, her request to continue benefitting from it was on the basis

of the distinctively unique position of the Ahl al-Bayt and the extra special loyalty of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to this illustrious household.

Had Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not adopted this course of action, it would have been easy for any Ṣaḥābī to make claims upon the Khulafā' in the name of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. What can then be said about the glorious members of the household and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا in particular, when her claim is directed to none other than Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the most devoted servant of the household.

Sayyidunā ʿUmar broke the conduit of Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as it was in too close proximity to al-Masjid al-Nabawī. However, when Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ confronted him and asked him how he had the authority to break something that was installed by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then history records how Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ mended it with his own hands and reinstated it.

Therefore, whilst Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is perfectly entitled to make such a demand considering her unique position, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had to contend with the following words of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ which we will discuss shortly:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity

Similarly, the testimonies also fell short of the requirement and it did not bear favourably for her. Added to this was the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ continuous practice of allotting the shares of the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

Therefore, even if we accept the fabricated Shīʿī report in its entirety it does not bear negatively on the ḥadīth of *Mishkāt* nor does it establish any criticism against the Ahl al-Sunnah. Conversely, it establishes the merit of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar. Now if they (cry foul and they) wish to consider this narration a fabrication, then by all means. But if they accept it as a valid narration, then they must accept it as explained in its proper context.

Criticism against Sayyidunā Zayd

If they offer the unacceptable excuse that even though the narration is correct, Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ passed away, Allah forbid, as a disbeliever according to their view because the Imām at that time was Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and he had no business

waging jihad and usurping the rights of the Imām. Since he did wage Jihad, it seems as if he considered himself the Imām and since it is only possible to have one Imām at one time, the other is an imposter and he is just like the person who makes a false claim of Nubuwwah. Since such a person is a kāfir, or the worst type of kāfir, the same is applicable in this case. So, what weight would his words have and how would he be able to represent the Shīʿī creed adequately? However, had he stated that Fadak was gifted to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—which is against his view—it would have been accepted but the explanation of temporary usage does not permit this possibility too be entertained.

Nevertheless, listen to the defence of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ presented by their own Qāḍī Nūr Allāh. Why should we bear the responsibility of establishing his merit? Nūr Allāh's words have higher status that divine revelation and this is what he records in Majālis al-Muʾminīn on the authority of Fuḍayl ibn Yasār, who transmits from the transcripts of Shaykh ibn Bābuwayh:

> Fuḍayl narrates that he participated in the battle which Zayd fought against the rebellious forces of Hishām. He narrates that when he returned to Madinah and met Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, who asked him: "Did you participate in the battle which my uncle fought against the people of Syria?"
>
> I replied: "Yes."
>
> He asked: "How many Syrians did you slay?"
>
> I said: "Six."
>
> He asked: "Do you have any reservations about it being lawful to take their lives?"
>
> I said: "If I had reservations, why would I take their lives."
>
> Thereupon Imām Jaʿfar said, "May Allah grant me a share of the reward of their jihad. By the oath of Allah, my uncle Zayd is a martyr along with his companions who have been killed and he has encountered a similar condition which ʿAlī and his companions encountered."[1]

Now consider the words of this Imām and his keen desire to be amongst those who fought this battle. Since Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ has been likened to Sayyidunā ʿAlī

1 *Al-Amālī al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq*, p. 431.

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, there can be no possibility of considering him a kāfir. Instead, he is among the cream of the Awliyā' and the esteemed martyrs. Otherwise there is no possibility of the Imām wishing to resemble him. This establishes that he was in conformity with the beliefs and principles of Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in every way and that he bore resemblance to Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his own way like the rest of the Imāms, such as Imām al-Bāqir, Imām Jaʿfar, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. However, none of them could be completely like Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Nevertheless, the words of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ would be considered final on this highly sensitive issue where both Sunni's and Shīʿah maintain that the group on the right path is entitled to Paradise and those who are wrong would be deserving of punishment.

Therefore, the contentious narration of gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah is a fabrication and despite this, it has made its way into some Sunnī resources for reasons already deliberated upon. Secondly, we have used the fabricated report about Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, from *al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah* against you, but will it ever be possible for those to understand who lack understanding so direly? How foolish of them to then rant and rave about something which actually is against them, and ʿAmmār ʿAlī then using it to deceive simple-minded Muslims is the height of shamelessness.

Taking the apparent literal meaning into consideration

If the Shīʿah refuse to bow down and shamelessly assert that whilst aʿṭā' does denote temporary usage, the instinctively apparent meaning that comes to mind when this word is used is Hibah, and it should be the preferred connotation especially in this narration.

However, before agreeing to this, we would request them to first apply this same principle to the statements of the Imāms, especially Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in praise of the Ṣaḥābah and Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ—some of which has appeared in this treatise—and thereby release themselves from the clutches of Shīʿism. Similarly, they should take the immediate implication of the Qur'ānic words and verses in praise of the Ṣaḥābah and believe whole-heartedly in it. We have every right to make this request to them, and if they agree to it, then no matter what, we will also accommodate their request.

Secondly, we say to this that if every text must be considered by its superficial, cursory implications then what is the value of depth in understanding and wisdom. Is it not failure to understand matters in its proper context that gives rise to so many misconceptions?

The differences of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah and likewise the differences of the Shīʿī mujtahidīn also arise from this. The difference between the *Akhbāris* and the *Uṣūlīs* amongst Shīʿī scholars also stems from this particular aspect. The Akhbārī takes what appears to be the cursory implication, whilst the Uṣūlī seeks to penetrate the depths and understand the objective of the sharīʿah and he is not content with remaining on the surface.

So if ʿAmmār ʿAlī wishes to take Hibah as the apparent and immediate implication of the word aʿṭā' and he wishes to remain embroiled in debate with us, then let him first disassociate himself from the Uṣūlī position and embrace the Akhbārī stance fully, so that we could really make him understand the baselessness of his beliefs.

Debating from an Akhbārī stance

Therefore, we say that we would accept that aʿṭā' denotes Hibah in this contentious narration, but only what will ʿAmmār ʿAlī and all Shīʿī scholars say about the fact that this narration is classified as Munqaṭiʿ? There was no existence of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ at the time when Fāṭimah requested Fadak, which must have been shortly after the departure of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Therefore, the narration of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ is an unsubstantiated statement which deserves rejection. Yes, had Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ been a legitimate Imām of the Shīʿah then his word could have been conclusive evidence for the Shīʿah only, who maintain that the Imām has unseen knowledge. However, Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ does not enjoy this privilege. Let alone being an Imām, he is not classified as a believer according to them.

The Ahl al-Sunnah are better off. Whilst they consider him to be among the high-ranking Awliyā', they would have to discard his statement because the principles of the Akhbārī's demands just that.

The possibility that he met a Ṣaḥābī and transmitted from him does exist, but if he transmits from a Tābiʿī, then this is also questionable as the liars made their appearance already and who did he receive this from? If Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ met

some very senior Ṣaḥābī then too we would need to verify if this Ṣaḥābī was narrating a first-hand account or he too relates it from someone. Who is this someone? Or did he just narrate something from someone who transmitted something which was commonly publicised as such. The possibilities are endless. How would we then determine that Fadak was gifted to her?

The condition of the narration of Mishkāt

As for the narration of *Mishkāt*, it is *marfūʿ* and *muttaṣil*. As for the Qur'ānic verse, it is mutawātir. However, it is possible for some ignorant person to claim that this narration is also baseless and disconnected since ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was not alive when this episode occurred.

Since we have established that their report is baseless, it makes no difference if we consider our narration baseless too, but for the benefit of the Shīʿah, we would not leave any matter unresolved. Therefore, though this appears as the statement of ʿUmar Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, it is actually transmitted from Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. When a Ṣaḥābī relates some action or utterance of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it is classified as a marfūʿ transmission for those who are unaware of the principles of ḥadīth.

In addition to this, there is another logical reason why ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz statement is correct. ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is explaining the reason for not taking control of Fadak, and he presents the fact that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not give it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا as his reason for not taking control of it. He has no personal motive in this at all. Thus, if his intention was not to take it then just as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not giving it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was a sufficient enough reason for him not to take, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gifting it to her would have also been a reason for him not to take it—if it were true that it happened—and in fact a greater reason.

So, if according to the Shīʿah this verdict is incorrect, and instead the opposite of it being Hibah is correct, then we ask what need was there for him to cause such harm to himself, in this world—by depriving himself of Fadak and giving it away—and in the hereafter, by speaking such a lie. And that too against whom? Against the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ! Why would he attribute a lie to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the punishment for which is hell as recorded in perhaps the only ḥadīth which is considered mutawātir in word and meaning:

من كذب على متعمدا فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

Whoever intentionally ascribes a lie to me, should take his seat in the Fire.

Nevertheless, the ḥadīth of Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, even if we overlook the fact that it is fabricated, it still does not have an unbroken link to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Fadak was overseen by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life

In addition to being a marfūʿ transmission, the signs of authenticity are visibly clear in the narration of *Mishkāt*. As for the other, in addition to being disconnected, the signs of fabrication and falsehood trickle from it. This is because historians are unanimous that Fadak remained under the administration of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life and a gift for which one has not assumed possession of is not considered finalised and complete. In fact, it would be considered as the possession of the actual owner. Since it was the possession of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ knew that it must be regarded as Waqf after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Why would he then even bother to seek witnesses when there was no question of giving it. This is because if the witnesses fulfilled the requirements then it would not have been possible for him to claim that the gift was not complete since the beneficiary did not assume control and possession, and it would then be obvious that he was just looking for a way to avoid handing over Fadak. If this statement had any validity, why did he not express it at the outset?

If the Shīʿah wish to consider his request for evidence a procedure for ascertaining the truth then what transpired thereafter should be justice and fairness as he merely did what he was compelled to, without establishing a new law on his own. If they accept what I have stated earlier on about the request for evidences and testimony then it surely would delight me, but can such a thought be entertained about those who are bereft of intelligence.

If Fadak was inheritance, then one person's possession of it should be regarded as oppression to the remaining heirs

It has been established that Fadak remained under the administration of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life and it is unanimous between the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah that the gifting of Fadak was incomplete, even if the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did give it to her. So why would Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا—whom we consider protected,

and they infallible—go on to make such a claim which results in taking what is due to others? If the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions are inherited then—in making such a claim—it deprives the remaining heirs. If not, then her claim would deprive the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer. And if not them, then the estate would be considered Waqf, where the khalīfah has the right to dispense its revenue or the actual item according to his qualified discretion. Assuming he decided to hand it over to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, how good would that have been? But surely Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim to it in this manner is not becoming of her.

Nevertheless, the signs of truthfulness are evident in the narration of *Mishkāt* whilst the signs of falsehood are glaring from the contentious report. Those who have understanding can see the truth clearly like the brightness of the sun, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his associates should be excused. What fault is there of the sun if such blind one's fail to see its brilliance?

Therefore, the narration in conflict with the one in *Mishkāt* is not of that calibre which demands that it be preferred over that which is in *Mishkāt*. Rather, according to the principles of ḥadīth the conflict between a strong and weak report demands that the weak report be rejected especially when—in a case like this—the stronger one is ascribed to Abū Dāwūd, which enjoys a distinct position as one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth. Therefore, the narration ascribed to Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله must be discarded.

Evidence about the beneficiary assuming control being a prerequisite from Shīʿī references

If we assume that the narration is valid and that Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim that it was gifted to her is in place, then too both sides maintain that the beneficiary must assume control in order for the gift to be complete. Therefore, as long as the owner does not cease control over the item, it remains his sole property. Consequently, ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī states the following in *Maṭlab al-Awwal*, under the discussion on claims:

فلا تسمع دعوى الهبة مجردة عن دعوى القبض

The claim of Hibah will not be heard without the claim of possession.[1]

1 *Al-Yanābīʿ al-Fiqhiyyah*, vol. 33 p. 39-29.

And Fadak remained in the possession of the Prophet ﷺ until his demise—according to the consensus of both groups—and throughout his life he maintained sole control over it, and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها never once interfered with this. The historians of both parties—Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah—are in agreement upon this, in fact so are the Muḥaddithīn of both parties.

Whilst it is not necessary to document the record of historians on account of easy access to historical journals, it is somewhat important to record the relevant ḥadīth reports; because they may be inaccessible to most people and because ḥadīth reports are weightier than historical reports.

The Ḥadīth reports of both sides

The ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the very ḥadīth of *Mishkāt* which bears ample testimony to this. Secondly, *Mishkāt* also records the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, transmitted by Malik ibn Aws ibn al-Hadathān, regarding the wealth of Fay', which comprised of Banū Nadhīr, Khaybar and Fadak. It states that the Prophet ﷺ allocated its revenue to three specific recipients. As for Fadak, the Prophet reserved its revenue for the wayfarer.

Now according to the laws of debate, our reference to our authentic resources suffices us because an objection can only be considered detrimental if it has substance. Since the administration of Fadak was the prerogative of the Prophet ﷺ till the end, the claim of Hibah is baseless as there was no handing over of control. So why should we take the responsibility of establishing from their resources, when the objection is baseless—since they agree that Hibah requires ownership.

However, silencing the opponent is one matter and giving them a satisfying response is another. Therefore, whilst this much silences the Shīʿah, he has no confidence in the authentic narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah and thus still remains uneasy. Therefore, I quote an extract from *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*, which is a reliable reference of the Imāmiyyah. This narration appears in other references as well and I will record the complete narration later on. Consider the following:

> When Abū Bakr realised that Fāṭimah was keeping a distance from him and avoiding meeting him or mentioning anything about Fadak, then he became somewhat perturbed. He thus decided to please her. So, he went to her and said, "O daughter of the Prophet ﷺ, your claim is true but what am I to

> do because I saw the Prophet ﷺ giving you what sufficed for you from it, and giving the labourers their share. As for the rest of it, he distributed it to the needy, the destitute and the wayfarer."
>
> Fāṭimah replied, "Continue to do the same, just as my father, the Prophet ﷺ, did."
>
> Abū Bakr said, "I promise to do exactly as the Prophet ﷺ did."
>
> Fāṭimah asked, "Are you making a promise to do the same?"
>
> Abū Bakr promised once again.
>
> Fāṭimah said, "O Allah, bear witness to this."
>
> Fāṭimah, thus, became pleased. Abū Bakr then gave her expenses and distributed the rest among the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

Consider the excuse given by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, that he witnessed the Prophet ﷺ dealing with a Fadak in a specific way, which excused him from handing it entirely over to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, and her agreeing to it and instructing him to continue executing its affairs in the same way. This as well as her pleasure at the end proves that Fadak remained in the custody of the Prophet ﷺ till the end and she had no authority over its affairs.

Similarly, he did not reject her claim that it was gifted to her. He entertained it but then carried out his obligation of asking for witnesses so that he would not be giving it away unlawfully, nor would she be receiving it unlawfully. He also asked for witnesses so that if they could establish the claim, then although the possession had not occurred—which was a prerequisite—he could give her preference to Fadak, but what could he do if the required testimony fell short. As for not giving it to her solely because of her claim to it, the response to this will appear later.

Still, if some deviant Shīʿī still has reservations and questions as to why Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was so intent on maintaining the rule of possession in gifts in relation to a gift given by the Prophet ﷺ. Is not an indication of the Prophet ﷺ sufficient? Therefore, it seems as if he had devious motives.

The response is that only Allah can spare one from such thoughts. This is the type of thoughts which troubled the Jews, Christians, Hindus and fire-worshippers regarding the Prophet ﷺ and it bothered the Khawārij regarding Sayyidunā

ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Both these groups feel that the respective claims to Nubuwwah and to being the rightful khalīfah was nothing more than a plan to gain worldly power and status. It was deviously hatched.

Friends! It gives one joy to reason with those who are balanced and fair, but debating with an ignoramus, biased, foul mouthed opponent is nothing more than mental exertion and exhaustion. The remedy for them is the whip or the baton, since the evidence of the Qur'ān and logical arguments are futile. Never mind, if there are four fools gathered at one place then perhaps the fifth one with them has some sense. If we have lost hope in ʿAmmār ʿAlī then it would not be correct to say that all the Shīʿah are like him? Who knows?

Witnesses and Testimony — a Response

If the Shīʿī report is correct and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did seek witnesses, then we have explained a possible reason for seeking witnesses. However, seeking witnesses could be for one of two reasons; firstly, the nature of the case was such that it demanded witnesses. If so, then the witnesses must meet all the requirements stipulated for the case to be effectively settled. So, let the Shīʿī scholars notify us of the requirements for testimony as recorded in the Book of Allah. Similarly, does the Qur'ān give any concessions or privileges in this regard? Similarly, the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is also established from the fact that when Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ informed him that he had taken permission from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to recall Ḥakam back to Madinah and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had agreed, then Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ asked if he had witnesses. If according to the Shīʿah—Allah forbid—there was a hidden agenda against Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on account of which he asked her to substantiate her claim with witnesses then why did he not forego this requirement for ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, whom Sunnī and Shīʿah maintain he had an alliance and friendship with? This incident only serves to establish his steadfastness upon the truth and his integrity in his affairs.

Yet the Shīʿah are victims of animosity and hatred. It has wreaked such havoc in their hearts and minds that right seems wrong and wrong seems right and the capacity to distinguish has been compromised irretrievably.

Secondly, witnesses could be required to establish the integrity of the claimant. So, if the claimant is innocent and not susceptible to falsehood then why should

witnesses be required to verify his or her integrity. They should seek this answer from Allah because Allah has ordained a minimum of two witnesses in every case, irrespective of the integrity of the claimant or the nature of the claim. This law has not been formulated by the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Ahl al-Sunnah are only interested in carrying out the commands of Allah. If the Shīʿah are disinterested, it is their discretion.

Had this not been the case then why would the Ahl al-Sunnah maintain that if one person witnesses the crescent of ʿĪd all alone, and his testimony is either rejected because of being one person only or because of his immorality and unscrupulousness, then he should observe fasting with the rest of the people. Similarly, what prevents them from accepting the testimony of a group of righteous women, when no male concurs with their testimony? For that matter there are many non-Muslims who are known to be far more truthful than many Muslims.

Therefore, the satisfaction of the individual is not the criterion, complying with the divine law is. It is an expression of servitude and submission to Allah.

The wisdom and purpose of this divine law is to ascertain and establish the truth. If this matter is left to the discretion of the ruler or khalīfah, then firstly there would be the fear of favouritism. Secondly, everybody would lay claims and consider themselves truthful. This would lead to the breakdown of peace and harmony which is the fundamental the purpose for having rulers. Therefore, the law has been stipulated to maintain peace and harmony as far as possible. Even if it is not favourable to some, the law must still be applied unequivocally in all situations.

Therefore, seeking testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا—whose integrity is unparalleled according to both groups—should not require added clarification. If anyone feels that such a request from her is akin to suspicion and mistrust that is the result of a flaw in their understanding. People of understanding are not intimidated by this.

Sayyidah Fāṭimah would comply more with the requirements

Since we cannot dispute that complying with the commands of Allah is the standard for determining piety and righteousness, as Allah says:

إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ

Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you.[1]

It implies that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهَا ought to have complied to the greatest degree. Similarly, she also ought to have the highest regard for others who complied with the divine command. Based on this, the request for proof must have brought immense pleasure to her and she must have been extremely delighted with the response of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. One wonders then, why the Shīʿah are so up in arms about this issue. It is like the situation where the claimant and defendant have settled the matter, but the judge still seems grumpy over the matter.

It is evident from the above discussion that there is a difference between rejecting the testimony of the witnesses and not passing judgement according to their testimony. Rejecting their testimony means that they are not credible, whilst not passing judgement according to their testimony could be because of not meeting the requirement in respect of witnesses.

Therefore, in the absence of two credible male witnesses or one male and two female witnesses, it would be impermissible for the judge to pass judgement in favour of the claimant despite the claimant and inadequate witnesses being held in the highest repute and esteem. If some fool misinterprets this action of the judge to denote rejection of the witnesses, then it is up to him. However, if the required number of witnesses are available and then the judgement is not given in favour of the claimant then it could be because of the rejection of the witnesses and their being not credible.

If we look back at the Shīʿī report, and consider it authentic, then it is apparent that Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا do not satisfy the requirements as far as numbers of witnesses are concerned. And if according to the lies of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا also testified then they were also incapable of testifying as they were children who lacked physical maturity.

Therefore, not passing judgement in her favour does not imply that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ rejected the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Umm Ayman, and Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ. Instead, it expresses his steadfastness upon the sharīʿah

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 13.

and the Sunnah. Fools consider this otherwise, but the coming of Ambiyā' also failed to rectify some people, what then if we fail? It reminds me of an incident mentioned by Imām al-Ghazālī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ in one of his books:

> One day Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was seen running towards the mountain in a haste. Someone asked him why he was rushing so anxiously and he replied, "There is a fool coming this way."
>
> The person asked, "So how does that affect you?"
>
> He replied, "There is no cure for foolishness, and it will not be removed by sound advice or the blessed company of a person; in fact, it has an adverse effect and may affect the latter."

Someone said it so aptly:

لكل داء و واء يستطب به الا الحماقة داء لا دواء لها

For every illness and condition there is a cure;

Foolishness though, is an illness with no remedy.

The Narration of Minhāj al-Kirāmah

If the Shīʿah still have a gripe about the issue and they still doubt the genuineness of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar, then let them be silenced for once and for all with the following narration from *Minhāj al-Kirāmah*, written by their ʿAllāmah Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, who is well known for his extensive writings against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

> *Their own batons striking their own heads.*

The Ahl al-Sunnah are now absolved of responding since the Shīʿah have settled the issue for them:

وَكَفَى اللّٰهُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ الْقِتَالَ وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ قَوِيًّا عَزِيْزًا

> *And sufficient was Allah for the believers in battle, and ever is Allah Powerful and Exalted in Might.*[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 25.

The narration goes:

لما وعظت فاطمة ابا بكر في فدك كتب لها كتابا ورده عليها

> When Fāṭimah admonished Abū Bakr about Fadak, he wrote a document in her favour and restored it to her.

When this narration appears in such an authentic resource of the Shīʿah and its author is none author than ʿAllāmah Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, then why argue with the Ahl al-Sunnah? This narration leaves them flabbergasted. They have been ranting and raving about the inheritance issue and that she received it as gift and they have made some claims but this narration, and from where it appears, leaves them speechless.

It is worth noting that let alone being defeated by what appears in our resources, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is always falsified by what appears in his books. A number of instances have already passed of this nature. In this instance consider how he has brewed the fiction of ʿAlī and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا testifying and dragging Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا into the issue. There is no mention of this fact in the entire library of Sunnī resources, even in the fabricated reports which the Shīʿah managed to get through. But if he alleges it does appear, then everybody can allege just about anything.

False allegation against Sayyidunā ʿUmar

ʿAmmār ʿAlī also says that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wrote the document then Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tore it up. Was he aware of the false allegation when he wrote it, because there is no reference to this in any of the references of the Ahl al-Sunnah? If this fact is being reported from their books then the first response to this is silence, as it is the best reply to a fool.

This is really a unique debate where the opponent is contesting what is a figment of his own imagination and it has no presence in any trusted resource. We need to ask him if *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* is a Sunnī book and if Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar was a Sunnī? Or was he the son of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ʿUmar's maternal aunt on account of whom he omitted the fact that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tore up the document.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī is but a novice in the field of Shīʿī deception and forgery. Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar is one of the experts and leaders in this field, whatever skill is to be found

in ʿAmmār ʿAlī is ten times more in him. However, it is true that some students excel their teachers. So, whilst Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar had some sense, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is bereft of sense altogether.

Reasons why Sayyidunā Abū Bakr gave Sayyidunā Jābir wealth without testimony

ʿAmmār ʿAlī may have one more contention because Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ gave Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wealth without requesting him to provide witnesses for his claim. Conversely, he dismissed Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا claim despite credible witnesses.

Firstly, if this narration even appears as a valid narration in Sunnī resources, then it was possible for those who lack understanding and insight to find a reason for objection. It will be known shortly whether this narration even exists in Sunnī references and whether it is a concocted report or not. Assuming that it does not feature in Sunnī references, making an objection out of this only establishes their hindsight.

If this is the manner in which objections can be levelled against the Ahl al-Sunnah then tomorrow the distorted texts of the Old and New Testaments, or the Granth of the Sikhs could likewise establish great claims against the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Shīʿah would not have much of a problem with it because they have the ability to assimilate with each of these deviant groups. Had I not been apprehensive of prolonging this discussion, I would have clarified how the Shīʿah resemble a giraffe. This peculiar animal has an unusual resemblance to a camel, buffalo and a cheetah.

Nevertheless, assuming that this narration does appear in one or two odd resources from the lengthy list cited by ʿAmmār ʿAlī, it has no relevance since those are unknown resources anyway. Secondly, they may have found their way into those references after the Shīʿah tampered with it. The readers will realise this shortly.

We have clarified the reasons why witnesses were requested from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Therefore, the incident of giving wealth to Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ upon his oath—which was ultimately intended for him—without him satisfying the requirements of testimony cannot be likened to the incident of satisfying the claim of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا without witnesses, as this could result in usurping the wealth of the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

The fact that seeking witnesses from Sayyidah Fāṭimah can also be seen as an attempt to favour him

Although we have dealt with this elaborately, we are dealing with people who lack a sense of balance and fairness, so we are compelled to highlight the facts once again. Therefore, the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah are unanimous that Fadak remained under the sole administration of the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه knew that the material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ become Waqf after his demise and he also knew that a gift is incomplete without the beneficiary being given control over it, then his request for witnesses surely could not be for the sake of ascertaining if she had ownership of Fadak or not. Therefore, it is incorrect for any fool to claim that her claim was rejected despite credible witnesses whereas Sayyidunā Jābir's رضي الله عنه claim was satisfied without witnesses.

The only logical explanation for requesting her to provide witnesses would be to determine if there was any indication from the Prophet ﷺ on account of which Fadak could be given to her. Now is this gesture favouring Sayyidunā Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or is it an insult to her and humiliation for her? The truth is evident for those who have understanding.

Failure to satisfy the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir could have been seen as a failure on the part of the Prophet ﷺ

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's thinking, however, is flawed. He views the action of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه regarding Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها negatively and implicates him for agreeing to the request of Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه.

Since there was a possibility that Sayyidunā Jābir's رضي الله عنه claim was correct because every claim cannot be false—and the Prophet ﷺ did make a commitment to him, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in his capacity as the deputy of the Prophet ﷺ was obliged to honour that commitment. If he did not oblige, it could have been seen as a failure to fulfil a commitment on the part of the Prophet ﷺ. To avert this, it was incumbent to oblige.

However, no blame could come directly upon the Prophet ﷺ since the wealth of Bahrain had not arrived. Since the position of the Prophet ﷺ is loftiest, it was unbecoming to allow this shortfall to remain. Therefore, when the wealth of

Bahrain arrived and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was discharging any unsettled obligations of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he settled the matter of Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ because it is not necessary that such a commitment was made to him in the presence of others. Intelligent people understand that this was inevitable to avoid any tarnish being attributed to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

If the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not commit to him and he made a false claim, then too it is inconsequential in the final equation since the wealth of Bahrain had to be distributed among the Ṣaḥābah anyway. The situation of Fadak was different; handing it over would constitute disobedience to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as he retained control over it till the end of his life and it had to be dispensed as Ṣadaqah on the basis of his words, "whatever we leave behind is to be disposed off as charity." We have committed to shed light on this ḥadīth and the time is very near when we will deal with it, Allah willing.

Therefore, Fadak had become Waqf property and there was no possibility of anyone inheriting anything from it. If anyone inherited, it would be disregarding the above ḥadīth of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his cohorts consider honouring the commitment of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and fulfilling his pledge something scornful and reprehensive.

When Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ succeeded the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the wealth of Bahrain arrived, he made announcements inviting those whom the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had unfulfilled commitments to, or those whom he had promised to receive their dues. This resulted in Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ receiving 1500 coins. This gesture of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ highlights his devotion to the Ahl al-Bayt and proves that he had no intentions of supressing anyone's dues. If he was so concerned about any possible commitments of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that he liberally gave those who claimed, why would he then seek to withhold what was due to the soul who was dearest to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Even if he withheld Fadak, then what did he gain from it. He neither used it for himself nor his family. Instead, he continued dispensing its revenue to the Ahl al-Bayt and to the recipients stipulated for it. It seems foolish then to withhold someone's dues without gaining anything from it other than perpetual criticism in this world and torment in the hereafter. Being so intelligent, did he not know how

to usurp something and make it worthwhile. After all, his intelligence cannot be disputed even by the Shīʿah.

Instead, the fact that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ understood the difference between the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the claim to Fadak proves what a genius he was. The claim of the Shīʿah of the gifting of Fadak is opposed by the ḥadīth, "what we leave behind is charity", whilst the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ cannot be countered by any ḥadīth. Similarly, there was no verse governing its revenue. Rather, it was either khums or ʿushr or some other tax, which Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was fully entitled to.

It is also clear to those who have intelligence that witnesses are usually summoned when there is a need to settle a contention or when any matter requires justification. When two people are disputing a matter, witnesses are sought to dispel the contention. Therefore, if a claim is made and there are no legal or logical grounds for contesting it, and especially if it is made by a true Muslim, then does the ḥadīth not demand positive thoughts of every Muslim? If the Shīʿah do not have intellect, let them borrow some for a moment and reflect on this. It is for these enemies of intelligence that the Qur'ān proclaims:

أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُوْنَ

Then will you not use reason?[1]

Therefore, if witnesses were not sought from Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and witnesses were demanded from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, according to the Shīʿah allegation, then this establishes the great insight and wisdom of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his strict compliance to the teachings of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If these two matters, wisdom and following the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are to be criticised, then ʿAmmār ʿAlī is correct in condemning him. If this is criticism, then we would praise him by saying that so and so is a donkey, a complete fool, steeped in immorality and vice, a liar and fraudster of a kind, etc.

If virtue is vice and vice is virtue, we would be compelled to sing the praises of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. But kindly do accept it from us in prose as we cannot render it in a poem.

---

1 Sūrah Ambiyā': 67.

Subḥān Allāh! The audacity to level criticisms against the most senior Ṣaḥābah and then deceive simple people by that. Consider the contents of his correspondence. He writes the following to Mīr Nādīr ʿAlī:

> **Now you decide whether this is injustice and oppression or not? If this is not usurpation, then what is? Similarly, is this classified as hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt or love? Is this what the rights of the Prophet ﷺ demand? The truth of the matter is that the Ahl al-Sunnah have such enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt that it makes them overlook the rights of the Prophet ﷺ.**
>
> **You have stated that you were not convinced about the Shīʿah stance of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Now, I ask you to record the response of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the light of what I have written. Ask them why Jābir was considered truthful and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā رضي الله عنها was not credible despite her presenting witnesses.**

So, I request them to present my response to ʿAmmār ʿAlī and let him know that unfortunately the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars could not verify what he has written since his claims are baseless. Ahl al-Sunnah scholars are not in the business of making wrong into right like their opponents do. Instead, they can rectify a wrong and make it known to the followers of ʿAmmār ʿAlī that his claims are wrong and that is why he has requested verification. The Ahl al-Sunnah are steadfast on the right path, so if guidance is your quest, grab the opportunity.

It is time to expose the reality of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who utters nonsense and makes ignorant remarks. Despite such glaring evidence and testimony, he still maintains that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه usurped Fadak and that a devout soul like Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was an oppressor. Even if he did not boast other merits, this single incident—as they claim—is sufficient to prove his merit. It proves his intelligence too and that despite knowing that he may be criticised for that, he remained steadfast on the command of Allah. When he did not profit from Fadak in any way, why would he be interested in usurping it?

Similarly, the fact that he may have sought witnesses from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and not from Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه makes another statement about justice and close ties. Consequently, those who have a very strong sense of justice are usually more stringent in applying the rules with their own, but they may be lenient to

others. Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bark's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not considering Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا establishes his genuine love for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

When avoiding favouritism to one's own and being lenient with others is a praiseworthy trait, then it was more incumbent upon him not to favour the family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, but apply the law correctly. So Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ remained steadfast and did not bother about criticism.

Dubious fanaticism

So, look at how they have twisted events. Despite being irreligious, they level claims of irreligiousness to those who are devout, and these followers of Ibn Saba' consider the devoted Ṣaḥābah to be enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt. If those who have trespassed the limits—in loving the Ahl al-Bayt—are considered greater than those who are devoted and loyal to them, and instead are actually considered their enemies, then this would be like saying that Christians love Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and that Nabī Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his followers hate Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

It is worth considering that one who is an extremist in his love is not necessarily in love with what he claims. Instead, he is love with his perceptions. Consequently, the Christians claim to love Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ but they do not love him in reality, because what they are in love with is actually him being the son of God, which he is not.

Hence, the Shīʿah have this perception (and they are fanatical on this basis). In reality, they are bereft of love for the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt. If they consider the Ahl al-Sunnah to be the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, then this is just like the Christians considering the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his Ummah enemies of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

The true enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt are those who do not regard Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا as the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ despite the Book of Allah, the words of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the narrations of al-Kulaynī and others affirming this.

Similarly, they consider Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—the beloved wife of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and one who has been praised by Allah in Sūrah al-Nūr, and the other wives of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ—regarding whom it is proclaimed:

وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ

and his wives are [in the position of] their mothers.[1]

as well as Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ—the honourable uncle of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Sayyidunā Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ—who is the son of the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ paternal aunt (i.e. his cousin) and who enjoys other familial ties with him as well, Muṣʿab ibn Zubayr—the son-in-law of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā ʿUmar—who is the son-in-law of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, Sayyidunā Zayd—the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, and many other close relatives of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who all qualify to be part of his *ʿitrah* (family) and Ahl al-Bayt as non-believers, renegades and enemies of Islam.

The details pertaining to most of the above has passed in this book. Nevertheless, they shamelessly claim that the Ṣaḥābah were enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt. If Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had enmity towards Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا then none among the Ahl al-Sunnah would have had anything to do with him. Or as is the case of the Khawārij—had the Ahl al-Sunnah been like them—they would have never revered Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Instead, they would have done as the Shīʿah do, Allah forbid, and adopted *Tabarrī* (disassociation) from the senior Ṣaḥābah.

Now consider, is it still correct for you to lament the religiousness of the Ahl al-Sunnah—in the light of your false claims—or is it the Shīʿah that are lamentable. More so ʿAmmār ʿAlī, whose hatred for the Ṣaḥābah leaves no consideration for the rights of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In fact, he has disregarded the testimony of Allah and the statements of the righteous Imāms. He brands whoever he sees among the Ahl al-Bayt as disbelievers and renegades on account of any inclination to the glorious Ṣaḥābah.

Luckily for the insensible scapegoat of Taqiyyah, otherwise Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan Ḥusayn, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, Imām Jaʿfar, and Imām al-Bāqir also would have not been spared from the title of kufr. Have these souls not praised the senior Ṣaḥābah lavishly? As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, they played a dominant role in supporting the Ṣaḥābah and the three Khulafā'. Then they wish to know from us the difference between seeking testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and releasing Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from this obligation.

---

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 6.

If they classify the support and praises of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and the other Imāms as Taqiyyah, why not consider the support of Sayyidunā ʿUmar and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا also as Taqiyyah. Or if the statements and actions of Sayyidunā ʿUmar, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, and Sayyidunā Zayd al-Shahīd are free from hypocrisy and deceit—or Taqiyyah—then why not consider the statements of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, and the rest of the Imāms free from hypocrisy and double-standards?

ʿAlī and Umm Ayman versus Allah and ʿAlī

Similarly, they should be told that we can agree that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not accept the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا as he was compelled to follow the command of the Qur'ān stipulating two male witnesses or two females and one male. But why did they reject the testimony of Allah regarding multiple daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ too in this regard. They cannot even say that the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ falls short of the requirement for testimony as far as numbers is concerned because the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ surpasses the requirement of two males or two females and a male. So why should the testimony of ʿAlī and Umm Ayman be valid but the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī invalid?

Even if we accept—for the sake of ʿAmmār ʿAlī—that there were four testimonies along with that of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, then although this still does not fulfil the requirement, we would ask them that when the Book of Allah and the statements of the glorious Imāms are profuse in the praise of the Ṣaḥābah, then why do they reject this testimony? This treatise has recorded the praises of the Ṣaḥābah from at least four Imāms. So, besides the testimony of Allah, this is adequate testimony. Why has it been rejected? If this is not the worst scenario of rejecting credible testimony than what is?

How lamentable is the religiousness of the Shīʿah? In venting their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah, they have not considered Allah, his Messenger and the illustrious Imāms too. Above all, they taunt the Ahl al-Sunnah. What foolishness!

ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his followers criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, whose merit is expressed by Allah and the illustrious Imāms. If this is not Kufr, then what is kufr? If this is not enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt, then what is?

The details of the above statement occur in this book and there is no need to repeat it. The respected reader can review it at its relevant place in the book.

They have criticised and condemned Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on the basis of a baseless and fabricated narration, which has no place in any authentic Sunnī reference as it states that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not accept her claim without witnesses and when she did furnish witnesses, he rejected it. However, this narration—considering it valid—does not indicate that he considered the testimony false or that he suspected them of lies. Instead, his decision was governed by the Qur'ānic law and he could not satisfy Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا request.

They condemn him on this basis and ignore the verses of the Qur'ān in his favour as well as the testimony and praise of the illustrious Imāms, which has been transmitted by credible narrators to them. And in the case of narrations the narration of a sole credible female narrator is also acceptable; there is no need for the required amount for testimony or for the narration to meet the criteria of *Tawātur*[1].

Nevertheless, we have dedicated much time to this issue and although I can elaborate upon it more significantly, this much suffices those who have understanding and who are fair and balanced. Even if the narration of the gifting of Fadak and the narration of seeking witnesses are legitimate reports, then too Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is pure from any criticism of any kind and he is completely innocent. In addition to this, the narration of *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī expresses that he did not die with the crime of usurping Fadak recorded against him. As for not seeking witnesses from Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, this matter has been dealt with more than adequately.

A possible ijtihādī error

In addition to this, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not infallible. He was after all a mujtahid and just like the Ambiyā' could err in Ijtihād a non-Nabī can also err.

---

1 The word *tawātur* (recurrence) is a mode of transmitting aḥādīth. Recurrence obtains when a ḥadīth is narrated through so many channels and by so many people that collusion upon forgery is deemed inconceivable (because of the assumption that such a large number of transmitters cannot find ways to conspire amongst themselves); knowledge engendered by this type is considered certain.

Consider the error in the Ijtihād of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and the correct Ijtihād of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as recorded in Sūrah al-Ambiyā'. On this basis, the Shīʿah could excuse him for his Ijtihād. Perhaps he erred in seeking testimony from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا or he erred in excusing Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Considering that he has been praised by Allah and the Imāms, it demands that he not be criticised.

If this does not satisfy them and he cannot be excused, then the narration of *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* seals the matter. It states that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا admonished him he rectified his error and handed it over to her. Now everyone knows that one who repents from a sin after receiving admonishment is purified from his sin and it is deleted from his records. Therefore, he is not guilty and he cannot be punished. Even if he failed to repent, the verses in his favour establish that Allah has forgiven him.

If an infallible Imām can be under the sway of Shayṭān then Abū Bakr is excused as he is not infallible

However, the Ahl al-Sunnah have no problem attributing an error to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as they consider him on the rank of a Walī, not on the rank of a Nabī. It is the Shīʿah who have a serious problem. They ought to review the following words of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, which appear in *Ṣaḥīfah al-Kāmilah*. If the Imāms are infallible and above the clutches of Shayṭān, consider what Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ says:

> قد ملك الشيطان عناني في سوء الظن و ضعف اليقين و اني اشكوا سوء مجاورته لي و طاعة نفسي له
>
> Shayṭān has taken control of my reins and led me to unbecoming thoughts and weak conviction and I complain to you of his evil association with me and my succumbing to him.

Now consider that the Imām cannot lie. The Shīʿah would become disbelievers if they consider an Imām a liar. Nonetheless, he admits to succumbing to the promptings of Shayṭān and unlike Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ there is no verse guaranteeing his entry into Paradise. (The Shīʿah consider him *maʿsūm* (infallible), and we consider him to be *maḥfūẓ* (protected). Similarly, the expressions 'unbecoming thoughts', 'weak conviction' and 'succumbing to him' cannot be disposed as ijtihādī errors, as the nature of the acknowledgement admits to grave errors.

Nahj al-Balāghah—a Shīʿī collection of the speeches of Sayyidunā ʿAlī—has similar admissions. In fact, the Qur'ān ascribes *Khaṭa'* (errors) to some of the Ambiyā'. The incidents of Nabī Adam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Nabī Yūnus عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام are well-known. So, the error of mishandling the issue of Fadak, or usurping it as the Shīʿah claim is a trivial offence as Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was fallible unlike the above personalities.

O most benevolent Allah, you are aware of my deepest admiration and greatest reverence for Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, the illustrious Ahl al-Bayt and the Ambiyā'. You are aware that my words are being recorded here on the basis of the principle which states that relating kufr does not constitute kufr, nor render the one who has related it as a kāfir.

The Ḥadīth about the estate of the Ambiyā'

ʿAmmār ʿAlī states the following as he continues:

> **Similarly, when she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself. He said that he heard the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying that the material possessions of the Ambiyā' should be disposed off as charity and none of it would be for their heirs. In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed off in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.**

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has had his say; now he should give us a hearing too. The early Shīʿī scholars criticise and curse Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ for not giving Fadak as inheritance to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. However, when they heard the response to their allegation from the Ahl al-Sunnah, then those who came later on fabricated the narration of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا receiving Fadak as a gift. They made great attempts to succeed with this dubious narration and even managed to admit it into some unpopular Sunnī references. They also appeared in the garb of Sunnī scholars of ḥadīth and managed to transmit it to unwary seekers of ḥadīth. However, the trick failed because the signs of falsehood were glaring from this narration. The game was over for the fraudsters as they were sniffed out and the books which

they managed to admit this narration into were unpopular resources. In addition to the narration failing them, the truth that liars have a weak memory proved itself as they failed to realise that a gift or Hibah is incomplete and inconclusive if the beneficiary does not get control and possession. Similarly, a claim cannot be established by the testimony of one male and one female and two children.

Nevertheless, their plot failed miserably and Allah and His Messenger ﷺ were on the side of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Consequently, Allah stipulates two males or two females and one male for establishing any claim and the Prophet ﷺ retained administration of Fadak till the end of his life.

The Shīʿah were bent on leading themselves to destruction so they fabricated a narration stating that Fāṭimah was entitled to Fadak because the Prophet ﷺ had a made a bequest to this effect. But they forgot that a bequest is only valid in wealth that can be inherited and there is no question of inheriting the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions.

The Shīʿah were faced with a predicament now. They had no basis to condemn Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and at the same time they had to fuel these allegations in order to appease their masses and to continue soliciting money and other benefits from them. If they lost hold of their masses how else would they receive a ḥarām share from the wealth of the deceased and enjoy *Niyāz* and offerings? The latter generations picked up the old allegations of their predecessors, gave it a new touch and kept the criticism and reviling of Ṣaḥābah aflame.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has done precisely the same in his letter to Mīr Nādir. But he was a foolish thief and did not even know how to present the case correctly. Therefore, he says that ʿAlī and Umm Ayman bore witness and he adds Ḥasan and Ḥusayn to the drama. He also makes claims of Hibah and inheritance at the same time, and also implicates ʿUmar رضي الله عنه for tearing the document up. Nevertheless, he has made great attempts to give credibility to his falsehood but it seems as if he has not come up against his match from the Ahl al-Sunnah as yet. If he had had an encounter with a learned Sunnī, he would have forgotten all his ludicrous claims.

All praise belongs to Allah, the Ahl al-Sunnah are on firm, unshakeable foundations. Why would it not be so firm when it is nothing but the truth? Let alone the great

scholars among the Ahl al-Sunnah, this humble soul can also strike deadly blows at the Shīʿah and some of it has passed in the pages before you. Nevertheless, let us asses his claims and deal with it bit by bit. He says:

> When she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself.

Honourable sir, a truthful and honest person acknowledges what is correct and we do not refute the fact that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا did make a claim to receive the inheritance of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If we were concealing something, we would have erased this narration from our books. The fact that we acknowledge and document that she claimed inheritance is enough to convince those who are just that the narration of gifting Fadak to her is baseless. [Since we document and do not deny,] we are not like ʿAmmār ʿAlī who refutes the records of *Nahj al-Balāghah* and the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī which establish that Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

No contradiction between Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth reported by Abū Bakr

However, the claim that this ḥadīth contradicts the Qur'ān is untrue. Those who are intelligent already understand by this statement the level of proficiency that the Shīʿah have as far as the Qur'ān is concerned. For a people who have no connection with the Book of Allah, how would they know what conforms to it and what contradicts it? But since we have to spell it out for them, let us commence by saying that this ḥadīth does not contradict the Qur'ān in any way. Not only does it conform to the Qur'ān, it embraces the Qur'ān.

But in order to understand this fully let us elaborate on the objection of it contradicting the Qur'ān in such a manner that would make the Shīʿah and their scholars grateful to us for it. After elaborating on the claim, we will respond adequately so that they may be shamed.

It must be stated though that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is fighting on the strength of others weapons; he has repeated whatever he has gained from here and there. He ought to have gathered the facts and presented his claim in a systematic fashion. Blurting established facts is surely not the art of debate. We could have simply responded by refuting all his claims and countering it with Sunnī beliefs, without even bothering

with the proofs and evidences for Sunnī beliefs. What would his response have been then? We would not respond in this manner, but we could have used the response of the Khawārij or the Nāṣibī for them. Consequently, we could have said that all the narrations about the merits of the Imāms and the right to being Imām along with all those narrations which forms the foundation of Shīʿah belief are but baseless, fabricated reports. What would ʿAmmār ʿAlī do then besides remaining silent and backing off?

But look at our kindness and fairness that we have undertaken to elaborate on the objection and state it in full and then respond to it.

The Shīʿī objection to this Ḥadīth

The Shīʿah have made great attempts to reject the ḥadīth—which is 'solely' transmitted by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ—by asserting that it is in conflict with the Qur'ān. They say that if a ḥadīth contradicts the Qur'ān, even though it has profuse transmission, it has to be rejected according to the Sunnī principles of ḥadīth. In this case, the transmission is by one sole narrator so it is even more incumbent to discard this ḥadīth.

Consequently, they assert it to be in conflict with the Qur'ān due to the following: Firstly, the following verse establishes the right of inheritance for offspring and it stipulates two shares for male offspring and one share for female offspring.

يُوصِيْكُمُ اللّٰهُ فِيْ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

Therefore, just as the rules of Ṣalāh, Ḥajj, Zakāh, and other matters apply to the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the laws of inheritance apply to him as well. Therefore, the claim that the Prophet's صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ wealth cannot be inherited is in conflict with this verse.

Secondly, the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr is in conflict with the following two verses as well:

فَهَبْ لِيْ مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِيْ وَيَرِثُ مِنْ أٰلِ يَعْقُوْبَ

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[1]

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُوْدَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[2]

These two verses establish inheriting from Ambiyā'. The second of the two verses say that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. The first verse records the prayer of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. He said: "So give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb..."

Thus, the second verse is explicit and it says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. This establishes inheritance from a Nabī. The first verse is not explicit but it expresses the words of a Nabī regarding inheritance and he surely knew better than anyone else about the prayer he was making. Similarly, he was not reprimanded for his prayer like Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. In fact, he received glad-tidings of the acceptance of his prayer and he was not admonished at all.

Nonetheless, these verses essentially establish inheritance from the Ambiyā'. Therefore, how could the statement of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, "our estate is not inherited," be correct? According to some versions of this ḥadīth, he said:

لا نرث

We do not inherit.

This also seems incorrect as Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was to inherit from Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

So, this is the elaboration of the allegation of contradicting the Qur'ān which we have recorded in full, such as cannot be possibly articulated by any Shīʿī scholar.

Response

Consider our response to this, which is soothing to the ears and pleasing to the soul. Our response will dispel all notions of this ḥadīth even being in apparent

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

conflict with the Qur'ān let alone actual conflict. Before digesting the response, it is essential to clarify some preliminary issues.

Firstly, there is no doubt about the entire Qur'ān being the word of Allah, from beginning to end. This is why it is known as *Kalām Allāh*. However, just like messages and correspondence of human beings, the nature of the address in the Qur'ān is of two types. Let us consider human correspondence and then understand this in the context of the Qur'ān. Consider how a person writes a letter to another, or despatches his messages to another person via an emissary. In both cases, the wording is that of the writer or sender, but the emissary is just the intermediary for conveying that letter or message. If we apply this to the Qur'ān, the majority of it is like this. Allah's address is either to the entire ummah or specifically to the Prophet ﷺ or to both. Sometimes the address is directed to a specific group. There is no need to illustrate this with an example but lest the Shīʿah fail to get the message, the following examples illustrate this:

يَا عِبَادِ فَاتَّقُوْنِ

O My servants, then fear Me.[1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ

O Rasūl.[2]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ

O Nabī.[3]

يَا بَنِيْ إِسْرَائِيْلَ اذْكُرُوْا نِعْمَتِيَ الَّتِيْ أَنْعَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ

O Banī Isrā'īl, remember My favour which I have bestowed upon you.[4]

Consequently, the first verse is an example of a general address (to all Allah's servants), the second and third is a specific address to the Prophet ﷺ and

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 16.

2 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67.

3 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 59.

4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 40.

the last is an address to the Banī Isrā'īl to remember the favours of Allah upon them. Nevertheless, in all the above instances, the wording and the meaning is from Allah; it is not relating anyone else's words.

The second example of human correspondence is like the case of a person who is ignorant of a certain language and he cannot convey his message personally. Therefore, a scribe converts his message into words and presents it on his behalf. In this instance, the message would be considered to be from the one who is ignorant of that language, though the words are not written by him.

Or take the scenario of a person who is directed by a lawyer to make certain remarks in a specific manner, the words emit from the person but they are actually the words of the lawyer.

In a similar manner, there are certain instances in the Qur'ān, which have been revealed by Allah, but it is understood that the reader of the Qur'ān is expressing those words by himself. Consider the wording and meanings of the chapters commonly referred to as the four '*Qul's*'. All other verses where '*Qul*' (say) or '*Qulū*' (all of you say) are other examples of this. In all these instances the content which follows '*Qul*' gives the impression that the speaker is the one who is addressing Allah with those words [yet the words have been inspired and revealed by Allah). In the case of Sūrah al-Falaq for example, the Prophet ﷺ is directed to say: "I seek refuge..."

However, when telling someone what to say it is imperative to tell them, "Say the following," but when handing a document for them to read, the command, "Say" would not feature. In the same way, certain verses in the Qur'ān are formulated in a manner that indicates that the person is addressing Allah with those words, or it is formulated in a way that gives the impression that the Prophet ﷺ is addressing (human beings on behalf of Allah.) In some cases, '*qul*' or '*qulū*' does not appear, but it can be likened to the document a lawyer gives the client with which he represents himself with; the instruction, 'Say' does not feature in it.

Sūrah al-Fātiḥah is a primary example of this, especially from

إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِيْنُ

onwards, which means:

> *It is You we worship and You we ask for help. Guide us to the straight path, the path of those upon whom You have bestowed favour, not of those who have evoked [Your] anger or of those who are astray.*

It is very obvious that Allah has formulated this text and handed it over to the servant so that he could express himself in that manner before his Rabb. It is impossible for it to be the prayer of Allah as He does not pray to anyone or seek guidance and assistance.

Evidence that the Prophet ﷺ is exempt from the Address in "Allah Instructs You Concerning Your Children."

Having established the above, it should be noted that the verse in question:

يُوْصِيْكُمُ اللّٰهُ فِيْ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

> *Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.*[1]

and in fact, the entire sūrah, has been revealed similar to Sūrah al-Fātiḥah. Allah has formulated the entire sūrah and handed it over to the Prophet ﷺ so that he could give instruction to people using the word of Allah, instead of his own words. The proof that this has been formulated on behalf of the Prophet ﷺ is the word *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all). Consequently, Allah does not say:

يَا عِبَادِيْ أُوْصِيْكُمْ

O My servants, I instruct you.

Had this been Allah's direct address to his servants, he would have said the above. Nevertheless, the manner in which it is phrased proves that the Prophet ﷺ is the speaker (on behalf of Allah) and that his followers are being addressed by him. He is educating them about the laws of inheritance using the text formulated by Allah for this purpose. This is just like the clerk of the court reading out the judgement of the judge to the claimant or defendant and informing them of the judgment given in their respective case.

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

Therefore, since Allah does not say, "O My servants, I instruct you," it establishes that the Prophet ﷺ is proclaiming the message just as is the case with Sūrah al-Fātiḥah, where it is understood that each and every person standing in prayer or reciting it is expressing its contents.

Similarly, when the clerk reads out the judgement, it is understood that the judgement is not directed to him (i.e. the clerk). In the same way, the Prophet ﷺ should be considered to be excluded from the proclamation being made to his followers. Consequently, the ḥadīth, "What we leave behind is charity," has been expressed to highlight his exclusion from that proclamation. This is why this ḥadīth is actually the Tafsīr of this verse. The confounded Shīʿah misunderstand it to be a distortion of the verse and claim that there is contradiction between the Qur'ān and ḥadīth. They are ignorant, but they blame Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Therefore, the Qur'ānic verse and the ḥadīth are in perfect harmony. In fact, the ḥadīth serves as the Tafsīr of the verse, which is the case with all the aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah for that matter.

Sometimes a ruler has an announcer proclaiming a new rule and it is understood from the nature of events that the one who is making the proclamation is also governed by that particular rule. Therefore, certain commands such as Ṣalāh, Zakāh, and Ḥajj are sometimes expressed in a tone, which according to the previous explanation demands the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion, but these apply to him as well on account of some other factors.

Nevertheless, since it has been established from this verse that the law of inheritance does not apply to the Prophet ﷺ, there was a possibility that some would fail to make the distinction and equate this to the commands of Ṣalāh, Fasting, and Ḥajj. Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ uttered the following statement:

> We the Ambiyā' are not inherited from, whatever we leave behind is charity.

Other examples of the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion

The fact that a different rule applies to the Prophet ﷺ is not peculiar to the case of inheritance. There are many other matters that are exclusively for the Prophet ﷺ. Consider the opening verses of Sūrah al-Muzammil and the following verse which make Tahajjud Ṣalāh mandatory upon the Prophet ﷺ

according to the majority view. However, Tahajjud Ṣalāh is not obligatory upon the ummah.

Similarly, fasting continuously without ifṭār was lawful for the Prophet ﷺ but prohibited for the Ummah. If a woman offered herself for marriage to the Prophet ﷺ, without the obligation of dowry, then it was permissible for him to accept her in marriage; but it is not permissible for the Ummah. Similarly, the Prophet ﷺ was excused from giving equal time to all his spouses but he maintained this throughout his life. The rest of the Ummah is bound to be equal in this regard.

Muslim men are permitted to have four wives, which appears at the beginning of this very sūrah. Consequently, the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah maintain that men can have four wives, not more. However, the Prophet ﷺ is excluded from this.

It seems that the reason for his exclusion from this command is the very same matter which we have already established and that is the tone in this sūrah is not a direct command from Allah, but a command given to the Prophet ﷺ to relay to the Ummah.

Similarly, the admonition in the opening verse of this sūrah should also be considered to be from the Prophet ﷺ. The verse is as follows:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوْا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِيْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِّنْ نَّفْسٍ وَّاحِدَةٍ

O mankind, fear your Rabb, who created you from one soul.[1]

Had this been a direct statement and address from Allah, it would have read as follows:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوْنِيْ فَاِنِّيْ رَبُّكُمُ الَّذِيْ خَلَقَكُمْ

O mankind, **fear Me, for verily I am your** Rabb who created you...

Therefore, (from the opening verse), the address is from the Prophet ﷺ to the rest of the ummah. This is why the command of inheritance would be applicable to the Ummah. Consider when a nurse or care giver directs the patient to take medication or avoid certain foods because of the doctor's instruction, then those regulations do not apply to the caregiver too. The Prophet ﷺ is also in the

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 1.

position of the caregiver for his Ummah and he has relayed the instructions of Allah—who is the Curer—to us. Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ relayed the contents of this sūrah and he was exempted from its regulations.

If any command is directed to the Prophet ﷺ then it is just like the doctor making a reference to something of relevance to the caregiver whilst giving instructions about the patient's prescription.

Therefore, we have established that the commands from the beginning of this sūrah till the end of the section on inheritance is expressed in relation to the Ummah. If the Prophet ﷺ is also intended in any command, then it is established by an external factor. And if not the entire sūrah, then surely till the end of the laws of inheritance, the text has been expressed in a manner that allows the Prophet ﷺ to convey it (as opposed to a direct injunction from Allah).

The exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ or certain rules being relaxed for him is a matter which has parallels in our mundane worldly affairs. Therefore, a military officer has certain privileges which a common soldier cannot have. Therefore, just as the Prophet ﷺ is exempted from the law stipulating four wives only, the Prophet ﷺ is not addressed by this law of inheritance. This implies that there is no conflict between the Qur'ān and the ḥadīth; instead they complement each other.

Rather, conflict and contradiction is that which stems from certain Shī'ī reports stating that some of the Imāms denied and deprived the other heirs from some of the belongings of their father and kept it to themselves, such as the sword, the ring, the copy of the Qur'ān and some garments. These narrations are recorded in Shī'ī references and the Ahl al-Sunnah have no record of these issues. So, on what basis was the inheritance denied or kept exclusively when the Qur'ān stipulates the law of inheritance in *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all)?

Nevertheless, even if the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is incorrect or fabricated, its contents are accurate and correct. The law expressed in that ḥadīth would still apply to Fadak and other material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ and they would not be inherited. It is no longer necessary for us to record evidences why this ḥadīth is authentic, nor is it necessary to establish harmony between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān.

But considering the fact that defending the chosen servants of Allah by defeating their enemies and silencing them would result in securing the favour of Allah, His Messenger ﷺ, and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه—who is the greatest among the Awliyā'—we will oblige and record another reason why there is conformity between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān. We would also give a response to the remaining verses which would be of benefit to those who are balanced and unbiased. We would then express why this ḥadīth is authentic and list the factors necessitating its authenticity, which is an issue contended by the Shī'ah.

A second dimension of conformity between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth

If the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ was not established from the tone of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and the tone was such which indicated a general address, or if some dim-witted person claimed that the address was general; then too there is no difficulty in accepting the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be authentic. If the ḥadīth is authentic it only qualifies the verse (serves as a *Mukhaṣṣiṣ*), it does not contradict it. Qualifying the verse shows that there is an exception, whereas opposing the verse means contradicting it and there is a difference between creating an exception and being in contradiction.

An example of creating an exception is as follows: A person says: "Everyone came to me except Zayd." Nobody considers this to be a contradiction (though he used the word "everyone" initially). However, when he says except Zayd, then the last part of the sentence qualifies the first part and creates an exception.

If somebody objects on account of the qualifying factor not accompanying the Qur'ānic verse as is the case with the example cited above; where the exclusion occurs in words alongside the statement, then we would say that it is not necessary for it to occur in words alongside the text. Consider that the exclusion of Zayd in the above example appears in words, but the exclusion of billions of other individuals is also implied without occurring in words. One often makes a remark of this nature, but the word "everyone"' has a very limited implication. It surely does not refer to all the people of the world. It may only refer to a small group, or the people of a little village or society. How is it that we understand and accept all these limitations in this speech without any reference to it in wording?

But if this example is not appealing to your understanding, then take another more concrete example. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

فَانْكِحُوْا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنٰى وَثُلٰثَ وَرُبٰعَ

Then marry those that please you of [other] women, two or three or four.[1]

Consequently, the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah among the Shīʿah are unanimous that four wives are the maximum for a Muslim male. So, if the command in *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) is general without exception then the command of *Fankiḥū* (then marry) is also general. Where is the exception for the Prophet ﷺ alongside it in explicit terms? Therefore, just as the Prophet ﷺ is considered exempt from it on account of other supporting texts, the same applies to *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all); other texts establish his exemption.

If they say that the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion in the case of polygamy is established from a Qur'ānic verse in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb, which is as follows:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا أَحْلَلْنَا لَكَ أَزْوَاجَكَ اللَّاتِيْ آتَيْتَ أُجُوْرَهُنَّ وَمَا مَلَكَتْ يَمِيْنُكَ مِمَّا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْكَ وَبَنَاتِ عَمِّكَ وَبَنَاتِ عَمَّاتِكَ وَبَنَاتِ خَالِكَ وَبَنَاتِ خَالَاتِكَ اللَّاتِيْ هَاجَرْنَ مَعَكَ وَامْرَأَةً مُؤْمِنَةً إِنْ وَهَبَتْ نَفْسَهَا لِلنَّبِيِّ إِنْ أَرَادَ النَّبِيُّ أَنْ يَسْتَنْكِحَهَا خَالِصَةً لَكَ مِنْ دُوْنِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ قَدْ عَلِمْنَا مَا فَرَضْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ فِيْ أَزْوَاجِهِمْ وَمَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ لِكَيْلَا يَكُوْنَ عَلَيْكَ حَرَجٌ وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ غَفُوْرًا رَحِيْمًا

O Nabī ﷺ, indeed We have made lawful to you your wives to whom you have given their due compensation and those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you [of captives] and the daughters of your paternal uncles and the daughters of your paternal aunts and the daughters of your maternal uncles and the daughters of your maternal aunts who emigrated with you and a believing woman if she gives herself to the Nabī [and] if the Nabī wishes to marry her, [this is] only for you, excluding the [other] believers. We certainly know what We have made obligatory upon them concerning their wives and those their right hands possess, [but this is for you] in order that there will be upon you no discomfort. And ever is Allah Forgiving and Merciful.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 3.

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 50.

Therefore, if the Prophet ﷺ was restricted to four wives then why did Allah list so many options of marriage for him? So just as this verse qualifies *Fankiḥū* (then marry) there should be a Qur'ānic verse qualifying *Yūsīkum Allah* (Allah instructs you all). Where is it?

We respond to this by saying that it is not necessary that a Qur'ānic verse qualifies the verse; this can also be accomplished by a ḥadīth. Since both are revelation, what is the difficulty in accepting this. But if they refuse to accept this, then we too reject that the verse Fankiḥū (then marry) is qualified by the verse they refer to. This is because when presenting something as evidence, then such evidence must be absolute and concrete, without other possibilities being entertained by it. Therefore, we say that the evidence is not absolute because *indeed We have made lawful* could be like the verse:

وَأُحِلَّ لَكُمْ مَّا وَرَاءَ ذٰلِكُمْ أَنْ تَبْتَغُوْا بِأَمْوَالِكُمْ مُّحْصِنِيْنَ غَيْرَ مُسَافِحِيْنَ

And lawful to you are [all others] beyond these, [provided] that you seek them [in marriage] with [gifts from] your property, desiring chastity, not unlawful sexual intercourse.[1]

which simply lists the women one is allowed to contract marriage to on condition that dowry is given to them; it does not relate to number of wives. The fact that Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before Sūrah al-Nisā' (and the verse *Fankiḥū*) establishes this possibility about the implication of the verse of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb.

Consequently, in *al-Itqān* under the discussion about the sequence of sūrah revelation, there is a sound ḥadīth establishing this. Therefore, there was no revelation about limited polygamy (as the verse *Fankiḥū* establishes) when the verse, *indeed We have made lawful*, was revealed. When polygamy was not limited then the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ has no relevance, it was still unlimited polygamy for all. Why reveal the verse (of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb) to establish what is known? Therefore, they are compelled to say that *Fankiḥū* (then marry) has been qualified by some other factor.

But if they contest this and say that the sequence of revelation may only apply to the opening verses of the sūrah and it does not necessarily establish that every verse

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 24.

of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before every verse of Sūrah al-Nisā'. Consequently, the ḥadīth of *al-Itqān* also gives some indication to this.

Well, this certainly does not silence us because it is not necessary for us to respond to all these possibilities. If they claim that Sūrah al-Nisā' was revealed before Sūrah al-Aḥzāb, or if the particular verse of Nisā', *Fankiḥū* (then marry), was revealed before *indeed We have made lawful* then they need to furnish evidence for it. Then only would their claim of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb qualifying the verse of Sūrah al-Nisā' be correct.

Yūsīkum Allāh is qualified by another verse

We are not short of answers because the verse, *Allah instructs you all*, is qualified by another Qur'ānic verse of Sūrah al-Ḥashr, and Sūrah al-Ḥashr according to the ḥadīth of *al-Itqān* was revealed after Sūrah al-Nisā'. Consider the following verse:

مَا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَىٰ رَسُوْلِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلّٰهِ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ كَيْ لَا يَكُوْنَ دُوْلَةً بَيْنَ الْأَغْنِيَاءِ مِنْكُمْ وَمَا أٰتَاكُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ فَخُذُوْهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوْا وَاتَّقُوْا اللّٰهَ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ شَدِيْدُ الْعِقَابِ

And what Allah restored to His Rasūl from the people of the towns, it is for Allah and for the Rasūl and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller; so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you. And whatever the Rasūl has given you, take; and what he has forbidden you, refrain from. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is severe in penalty.[1]

Now to all the ʿUlamā' of the Ahl al-Sunnah and balanced Shīʿī, it is evident that Allah has stipulated six shares from the wealth of al-Fay'. Consequently, some maintain that the share of Allah must be spent on the Bayt Allāh and Masājid. However, the majority maintain that the wealth of al-Fay' has five recipients only; it should be divided into five shares.

However, since the text *for Allah and for the Rasūl* which appears here appears exactly in the same manner in the opening verse of the tenth juz', under the recipients

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6.

of khums, and the Shīʿah consider it as five recipients there, so it would be the same five recipients here too in the verse of Sūrah al-Ḥashr. In this case, the *for Allah* would mean that wealth which is dispensed according to the command of Allah and to the recipients designated by Allah. Since the wealth was given for the cause of Allah, it is referred to as *Lillāh*. Since the recipients have been stipulated by Allah, it is also called *Lillāh*.

Nevertheless, *for Allah* means that wealth belongs to Allah and it must be given to certain people for the pleasure of Allah. The reason for referring to Fay' as the wealth of Allah is that Fay' is such booty which comes into the hands of Muslims simply on account of the awe of the Muslim army, or by a peace treaty. Therefore, Allah has handed over such wealth by his grace to the Prophet ﷺ and the army did not engage in any battle prior to it.

But since the awe of the Prophet ﷺ was augmented by the large army of the Ṣaḥābah, some of them could have desired a share of the Fay'. Subsequently Allah informed them that since their efforts were not utilised and that Allah had granted it to the Prophet ﷺ as a bonus, therefore it was better to leave that wealth to be distributed according to the decree of Allah to the recipients cited in the aforementioned verse.

Whilst the words to *His Rasūl* establish the rights of the Prophet ﷺ over it *for Allah* qualifies this, and clarifies that the Prophet's ﷺ administration is not on account of his *milkiyyat* (ownership), rather it is on account of him being given custody over it (become its *mutawallī*). Therefore, he was the treasurer and caretaker, not the owner and possessor. If he was the sole owner, then why were others allotted shares in it?

If we assume for a moment that the Fay' is the sole property of the Prophet ﷺ and that stipulating a share for the recipients is like how a portion of zakāh is claimed from the affluent person's wealth, then even though this assumption is negated by the wording of this Qur'ānic verse, it would imply, Allah forbid, that the Prophet ﷺ left this world without discharging his obligation to the aforementioned recipients (since he did not allocate or demarcate their share of it). Such an implication can only be entertained by the Shīʿah. The Prophet ﷺ could not have been relieved simply by spending from its revenue on the specified recipients because the phrasing of the verse, *And what Allah restored*, shows that

they have a tangible share of the Fay' itself over and above its revenue. Therefore, we cannot entertain the possibility of the Prophet's ﷺ ownership.

In the light of the above repercussions one fails to understand how the Shīʿah fabricated the ḥadīth of gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, or how do they adopt the view of his biological heirs being entitled to it solely. In fact, they consider Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها exclusive entitlement to it and criticise the Ṣaḥābah in general and the three Khulafā' specifically. If they perpetrated this error on account of ignorance, then what is the delay in repenting and making amends now?

Yes, if we assume that Fadak did not come into the Prophet's ﷺ possession as Fay' (but in some other manner), or that Fadak was the piece leftover exclusively for the Prophet ﷺ after having designated the balance of the land for the stated recipients, then their claim could have had merit. But ask them who can contest that Fadak was received as Fay' or that it was not a dissected or cut up piece of land left for the Prophet ﷺ?

The idea of Fadak being the legal share of the Prophet ﷺ from the rest of the lands does not work out for the Shīʿah anyway. This is because if many settlements were received on account of a truce with each different group then each settlement has to be dissolved between the recipients individually due to the manner in which the verse is phrased.

If some obstinate Shīʿah decided to reverse the claim and instead say that Fadak was the fifth [khums] share which the Prophet ﷺ received as booty; it was not Fay' then the same issues arise once again. This is because the verse which establishes the Prophet's ﷺ share of the Fay' along with the remaining four recipients appears in the same format in Sūrah al-Tawbah regarding khums. If they have any doubts about my statement on account of their ignorance of the Qur'ān, then copies of the Qur'ān are readily available for them to review.

Added to this is the fact that khums is the share from booty or spoils of war. So, if Fadak was booty that was received after a battle then the Prophet ﷺ (along with the four recipients) is only entitled to khums, one-fifth, and the remaining is the share of the soldiers. Therefore, there is no way the Prophet ﷺ could have had ownership of the complete Estate of Fadak.

It is also not possible that Fadak refers to the leftover portion of the Estate which was solely for the Prophet ﷺ since historians and the author of al-Qāmūs are

unanimous about the definition of Fadak. Actually, the Shīʿah also cannot dispute this. Therefore, the possibility of Fadak referring to the specific portion of the Prophet ﷺ from that Estate is null and void. It is likewise impossible to say that the Fay' or khums estates belonged solely to the Prophet ﷺ.

Fay' — not sole ownership

There may be some who still dispute that Fay' belonged to the Prophet ﷺ and that the other recipients can be likened to the obligation of zakāh upon one's wealth. Despite this interpretation not being supported by the verse, the word *for Allah* clearly establishes that the Prophet ﷺ does not enjoy sole ownership.

Secondly, if *what Allah restored to His Rasūl* already denotes the Prophet's ﷺ ownership, then what is the purpose of saying *for the Rasūl*? Then instead of this, Allah could have phrased this verse and the verse of khums as follows without adding *for the Rasūl* to it, as follows:

فَلِلّٰهِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبٰى

If someone says that ownership is not established from *what Allah restored to His Rasūl*, instead, it is established from *for Allah and for the Rasūl*, then this is more foolish than the first suggestion. This is because if the *Lām* in *Li l-Rasū* (for the Rasūl) establishes ownership, then the same *Lām* appears in *Li Dhī al-Qurbā* (for the near relatives), etc. This implies that prior to it being received as Fay' it was not in the ownership of the stated recipients (including Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى) and it only came into their possession after it was made over to the Prophet ﷺ.

Consequently, prior to being handed over, it was in the possession of the kuffār and their control over it was legal and valid. Similarly, if they embraced Islam or accepted the jizyah, it would have remained in their custody. Therefore, the Fay' was previously owned by kuffār (and according to their suggestion, it then came into the ownership of Allah and the other recipients after it was handed to the Prophet ﷺ).

Similarly, if *Lām* denotes ownership, then the *Fā*, which is for *Taʿqīb* (elucidation), implies that Allah was not the owner of this prior to that and this can only be entertained by the Shīʿah. The meaning of *Fā* is that it was initially in the ownership

of someone [i.e. kuffār] and thereafter it came into the ownership of Allah. And since two owners cannot have complete ownership over one item at the same time, it creates this impossible situation of saying that Allah had no ownership of it prior to giving it to the Prophet ﷺ.

This absurdity can only occur if the nature of Allah's ownership and the nature of the kuffār ownership is considered the same. However, if the Shīʿah assume the stance of the Muʿtazilah in this matter—who declare the human being the Creator of his voluntary actions and equate Him to Allah in this respect—then who can restrain them from such folly? Therefore, if they consider the nature of the ownership of the Creator and the creation to be equal, then who could restrict them? As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, they consider Allah the actual owner whilst His creation has been given temporary administration over it and there is harmony between sole ownership and temporary administration, unlike sole ownership being declared for both the Creator and the creation.

If we dismiss the above implication which rises from the Shīʿī interpretation and embrace the Sunnī concept of ownership and temporary administration, then what about the temporary administration given to the other recipients, which is a result of considering the *Lām* for *tamlīk* (ownership). This would imply that all the stated recipients enjoy temporary administration.

Another interpretation

If they say that *Dhū al-Qurbā* (near relative) is attached to *for the Rasūl* and these two then combine and become attached on Allah, then the meaning is still distorted. This would mean that Fay' is equally owned between Allah and between His Rasūl and the other recipients. This meaning cannot be entertained by any Muslim as it demands that just as booty is distributed among the participants in battle, Fay' also ought to have been distributed among the stated recipients thereby according them the liberty to do as they please.

So, who is to bear the blame for the recipients not receiving their share in the manner stated above? Let alone the Prophet ﷺ, the Ahl al-Sunnah cannot even entertain such a shortcoming on the part of his Ṣaḥābah. The Shīʿah, however, do not have any difficulty in levelling such accusations and making these allegations. One who scans their resources will unearth far worse accusations than this.

Similarly, if the distribution were to be made then another problem arises. In the case of booty, the participants in battle are limited and known. As for the relatives, poor, destitute and wayfarer; their numbers are unknown and giving each one their share is impossible. Sharing the actual land between them all is unfathomable and even distributing its revenue to all as required is beyond the capacity of anyone.

Therefore, the revenue of Fadak did not reach each and every wayfarer, destitute and needy person, neither in the era of the Prophet ﷺ nor in the era of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. If we limit the revenue to those among these four recipients who are Muslim only, then too it is a task that can never be accomplished.

A third interpretation

If we assume that *For Allah* in this verse establishes absolute ownership of Allah, *For the Rasūl* refers to temporary ownership and administration of the Prophet ﷺ and *for the near relatives* till the end, lists the beneficiaries and recipients then the Ahl al-Sunnah would have no difficulty with this assumption except that it would have negative implications for Allah as will be explained shortly.

Firstly, the Prophet ﷺ enjoys no exclusive ownership, it is just referred to as his ownership (as the beneficiaries are stipulated). Therefore, if his so-called ownership is transferred and inherited by his heirs, then his heirs cannot be entitled to the share of the beneficiaries too. If the share of the beneficiaries must be transferred, then it must go to the heirs of those who were its beneficiaries during his blessed lifetime.

This clarifies the reason for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه denying Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها request as she requested sole possession of it and she did not ask for administration of its affairs as the Prophet ﷺ was instructed to administrate it. Therefore, the claim of Hibah or inheritance results in the rights of the remaining beneficiaries being trampled. The narration from *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*—some of which has appeared previously—bears ample testimony to this. Therefore, if it were not for requesting sole rights to it why would Sayyidunā Abū Bakr refuse Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to administrate its affairs in a legitimate way. Why would he excuse himself by saying that he had seen the Prophet ﷺ adopting a certain course with Fadak and he was bound to do the same.

Those who are genuine accept the truth even if is against them. So, when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا realised the truthfulness and veracity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, she was satisfied with his decision and his administration. This appears in the narration of *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*.

If the Shī'ah cannot accept this, it proves their displeasure with Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and that they, falsely, use the Ahl al-Bayt to incite enmity against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

The trouble with giving the Lām multiple connotations

The above explanation is given in the light of *Lām* denoting absolute ownership for Allah, temporary administration for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and listing beneficiaries. This explanation suits us fine and accordingly Sayyidunā Abū Bakr administrated Fadak after the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and gave what was due to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

However, this consolation from the Ahl al-Sunnah will not really help the Shī'ah too much. What about all the other problems this interpretation creates? Firstly, if Allah really wanted to give ownership to his beloved Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then why make it so complicated that other beneficiaries are inextricably wound up with it? Secondly, the miraculous eloquence of the Qur'ān remains unchallenged in even a short sūrah like al-Kawthar. But if we accept this interpretation, then the Qur'ān loses its miraculous eloquence because the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ receives ownership but he is denied of sole discretion and authority over what has been given to him. Similarly, (the multiple and diverse connotations of *Lām*) is something which is hard to accept. Instead, the opposite of that interpretation appears to be valid and nobody has perhaps elaborated on this impossible interpretation as I have.

Thirdly, if the *Lām* of *Fa li l-lāh* (for Allah) cannot be for *tamlīk* (granting ownership), simply because *tamlīk* could only occur when there was no ownership prior to that, which cannot be so in the case of Allah, then this is acceptable. Then would the same be said about the *Lām* in *Dhū al-Qurbā*, etc. Surely these other recipients cannot be on par with Allah having perpetual and absolute ownership since ever.

Fourthly, if the ownership of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is like the ownership which humans have over their possessions then the link between the words demands the same type of ownership for the other beneficiaries too. But if the ownership of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is distinct like the ownership that Allah has, then just as how

there is no inheritance in the possessions of Allah, there ought to be no inheritance in the possessions of the Prophet ﷺ.

Reasons why the Prophet's ﷺ possessions cannot be inherited

Considering the second alternative, there are two factors supporting the notion that the Prophet's ﷺ possessions cannot be inherited. Firstly, the Prophet ﷺ and every other Nabī of Allah is alive in his grave and a living person's ownership does not terminate over his possessions. Just like how a person remains absent from his family for a period and they distribute his belongings, it remains his and he has every right over it. Their ownership is not established by distributing it amongst themselves. the Prophet ﷺ also remains confined to his grave and none can have ownership of his possessions. This is the reality behind the ḥadīth transmitted by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه but the Shīʿah cannot understand.

If the Shīʿah dispute this and disagree to the fact that the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave then there is a second factor which is as follows: On account of the great insight into realities which the Prophet ﷺ had, he realised the absolute ownership of Allah over everything all the time. He never considered anything to truly belong to him. This is just like how someone is invited for meals at another person's home. He considers the food presented to him as being the possessions of the host, which he has been allowed to benefit from him according to his requirements. He has no authority to do as he pleases or take it away from the home for his dependants just as he has no authority over any of the furniture or decor of the home. If he had any degree of authority over it, it would not have been considered a flaw if he were to take it home or do anything else with it.

The Ambiyā' also consider what has come into their possession in a similar manner. They consider such possessions to be in the actual ownership of Allah and that they have been allowed to benefit just as the guest helps himself to what is offered to him. Since they maintain that they have no real ownership and that it has been loaned to them, they maintain that their heirs have no entitlement to it. This is why the Prophet ﷺ said:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from, what we leave behind is Ṣadaqah.

Dispelling the misconception

If the possession of the Ambiyā' is really not theirs on the basis of the above, then this would imply that their selling or purchasing any item should not be valid. It requires someone very foolish to assume this because in this world also we see that when there is a relationship of attachment and love between two people, then the one allows the other to sell his or her possessions if the need arises for him to do so. When there is a very close relationship between two people then permission is not required to do as one wishes, what then can be said about Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ based on the relationship between them. Therefore, one has free reign over the possessions of another, but despite this one would not consider oneself the owner or feel that one's heirs should be entitled to inherit it.

Consequently, the intimate understanding of realities compels the Ambiyā' to consider sole ownership of everything to Allah all the time, even in that which is given for their temporary disposal. They utilise of it as per requirements without considering themselves entitled to it at any time.

All humans besides the Ambiyā'—despite their perfections and merits—cannot be on par with the Ambiyā' in this perception. The comparison between the Ambiyā' and normal people is like the comparison between children and elderly, wise people, or like the comparison between sane and insane people. Therefore, when a child or a fool gets control over an item that belongs to another person, they consider it to be theirs. If someone tries to draw it away from the child, the child throws a tantrum and gives a fight. This reaction from the child sometimes compels the owner to release ownership to the child.

Similarly, ordinary humans consider themselves the sole owners of material belongings which actually belong to Allah, but are given to them on a temporary basis. They may verbally acknowledge that everything belongs to Allah, but the attachment of their heart to it tells a different story.

If someone—in resembling the Ambiyā'—really feels that it belongs to Allah, then firstly his perception cannot be as genuine as the perception of the Ambiyā'. Secondly, how would anyone else be convinced about this truly being his inner state? Therefore, it cannot be said that his wealth should not be inherited like the wealth of the Ambiyā'.

The summary of this discussion is that the ownership of the Ambiyā' is just like the ownership of Allah, wherein inheritance is not established. If somebody feels that this discussion on the possession of the Ambiyā' is biased, then so be it; there are other reasons why inheritance is not established in the possessions of the Ambiyā' and this still creates a problem for those who claim that inheritance must be established. Similarly, if *for the Rasūl* establishes the Prophet's ﷺ superficial ownership only, it does not have any negative impact for the Ahl al-Sunnah, but does this interpretation really make sense? Therefore, the *Lām* in *li l-Rasūl* (for the Rasūl) and in *li Dhī al-Qurbā* (for the ear relatives) cannot establish *milkiyyāt* (ownership) and *istiḥqāq* (entitlement) in the same manner as the *Lām* in

لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

For the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

and

فَلَكُمْ رُءُوْسُ أَمْوَالِكُمْ

You may have your principal amount.[2]

respectively.

What Does the Lām Denote Then?

If we say that the function of the *Lām* is to list the beneficiaries as is the case with the following verse, then even the Shī'ah are compelled to accept this interpretation because it appeals to the intellect. Such as in the verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَالْعَامِلِيْنَ عَلَيْهَا وَالْمُؤَلَّفَةِ قُلُوْبُهُمْ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ وَالْغَارِمِيْنَ وَفِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ فَرِيْضَةً مِنَ اللّٰهِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [zakāh] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam] and for freeing captives [or slaves] and for those in debt and for the cause of Allah and for the [stranded] traveller, an obligation [imposed] by Allah.[3]

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 279.

3 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

But if they lack intelligence and do not understand, then let them consider the function of *Lām* in the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl, i.e. the verse of khums:

وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلّٰهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Rasūl and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveller.[1]

This *Lām* is for listing beneficiaries according to their scholars too. This is affirmed by Abū al-Qāsim referred to as *Al-Muḥaqqiq*—who is the author of *Sharā'iʿ al-Islām*. Other Imāmiyyah scholars also concur with this. In fact, this is transmitted from the Imāms too.

Beneficiaries do not have ownership of anything before it is given to them just like how a destitute or needy person has no authority over zakāh prior to receiving it.

Nevertheless, since the *Lām* is not for *milkiyyah* or *istiḥqāq*—but rather for listing beneficiaries—it explains why the Prophet ﷺ always distributed from the revenue to the beneficiaries but he did not distribute the actual land and allot shares for the respective recipients. But if the *Lām*—which appears before the recipients—denoted *milkiyyah* and *istiḥqāq* then the Prophet ﷺ would have had to distribute the actual land because that is primarily the Fay', not the income or revenue thereof. This fact requires no further clarification.

Objection from the Shīʿah

If they accept that the beneficiary has no prior ownership over what he has received but the words *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored) demand that the Prophet ﷺ distribute the actual land among the recipients, and not its revenue. This humble scholar would say to them that the Ahl al-Sunnah would give a logical explanation to this too, but let the Shīʿah consider for a moment whom they are criticising. This criticism does not fall on the Ahl al-Sunnah; it targets the Prophet ﷺ directly.

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 40.

As for the Ahl al-Sunnah—on account of our īmān in the Prophet ﷺ—we blindly accept his actions to be correct even if there is no evidence for it. But considering that we have laboured so intensely to defend the honour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah, why would we not defend the honour of the Prophet ﷺ?

Therefore, if out of enmity and hatred for the Ṣaḥābah, the Shīʿah deem it appropriate to level criticism against the Prophet ﷺ by saying that the verse does not advocate distribution of revenue to the beneficiaries. It actually requires distribution of the land and if this is so, why did the Prophet ﷺ not do so? Had he distributed it, he would have had sole ownership of a chunk of it and Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim of inheritance to this piece of Fadak would have been valid. Similarly, this would not implicate Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها—who is infallible according to the Shīʿah. She is implicated by seeking inheritance in something which actually did not belong to her father. Therefore, instead of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, this had led to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being criticised whilst she is infallible.

Similarly, if an owner of an item [i.e. Allah] hands it over to one person and entrusts him with the task of distributing it between himself and the rest of the beneficiaries, then even though he has not distributed it, he has no entitlement to the share that would have been, had the distribution taken place. This is because the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah maintain that Hibah to multiple beneficiaries in one item does not accord anyone ownership unless *qabḍ* (taking possession) occurs and qabḍ cannot occur without distribution taking place. Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ had *qabḍ* till the end of his life (without distribution). So, if any of the other recipients cannot have ownership prior to *qabḍ*, then the Prophet ﷺ had *qabḍ* (without distribution) over the whole Fay', including his portion. This establishes that his ownership cannot be finalised whereupon the claim of inheritance from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها could be entertained.

Nevertheless, the Shīʿah have two objections against the Prophet ﷺ for distributing its revenue and not the actual land. Firstly, his actions are in conflict with the verse. Secondly, it has become difficult for them to retain the claim of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being infallible on account of his not effecting distribution of the land.

We are now compelled to respond and defend the honour of the Prophet ﷺ. Perhaps it will secure us a good position in the hereafter and it will silence the Shī'ah forever.

Fay' is actually Waqf — not personal ownership

Before proceeding, the Shī'ah out of hindsight level such objections which are detrimental to their own faith without tarnishing the image of the Ahl al-Sunnah in any way. Nevertheless, *what Allah restored* appears as *Jumlah Ismiyyah* (a nominal sentence). In eloquent expression, *Jumlah Ismiyyah* denotes constancy and perpetuity (i.e. dawām and thubūt). This demands the perpetual attachment of the recipients which are Allah, His Rasūl, Dhū al-Qurbā, etc., to it. The perpetual relationship between the two can only be envisaged if Fay' is classified as Waqf. In other words, Waqf remains forever in the ownership of Allah and the beneficiaries benefit from it perpetually.

Difference between Ṣadaqāt and Fay'

Whilst the same Jumlah Ismiyyah occurs in the verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy.

there is a difference between Ṣadaqah and Fay' for those who understand. Giving Ṣadaqah is an instant action and there is no perpetuity to the action. It terminates just as rapidly as it commenced. Therefore, prior to releasing it, it is not classified as charity. Had it been charity before it was dispensed all the promises of Allah for giving charity ought to apply, such as being entitled to rewards, discharging one's obligation, cooling the wrath of anger of Allah, etc. Similarly, after being received by the needy, it again loses its classification as Ṣadaqah. Therefore, if the needy person then entertains a wealthy person or a Sayyid with it, it is considered valid and permissible. Therefore, the wealth of Ṣadaqah is only classified as such in the moment when the exchange takes place, not prior to it and not after that.

Nevertheless, *what Allah restored* denotes perpetuity but (in philosophical terms) perpetuity arises only when the subject remains forever attached to the predicate. However, it is not anyone's task to identify the actual subject in each situation.

This requires in-depth understanding and insight, which is divinely conferred to whomsoever Allah wills.

Therefore, in *what Allah* restored the actual subject is the word Mā (what), which is a reference to Fay' lands. As for the word *Afā'* (restored), it is for clarification and dispelling ambiguity. Therefore, *for Allah* onwards [and the rest of the recipients] will remain forever attached to it. In philosophical terms, this is known as *Qadhiyyah Da'imah* (perpetual relationship). Having understood this, it is evident that the Prophet's ﷺ action was in conformance with this verse.

Infallibility of Fāṭimah

As for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being infallible and such a gesture impacting on her infallibility, it should be known that the Ahl al-Sunnah do not entertain this belief about a non-Nabī. Similarly, in the discussion on the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ, we have explained how an infallible can have a misunderstanding and fallible human can have the correct perception. There are numerous other instances of this which appear in the Qur'ān and Sunnah. The example of Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام passing judgement which was not as accurate as that of Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام, who was not yet a Nabī, or an Imām as Shī'ī terminology requires. But if the Shī'ah do not know the contents of the Qur'ān then it is not our fault.

Consequently, the objection levelled by the Shī'ah towards the Ahl al-Sunnah for following such leaders who are fallible and can err is just like the case of a blind person saying that the sun has no light and him saying that there is no vision in his eyes. So, this allegation of the Shī'ah does not show any shortcoming in the Ahl al-Sunnah; it actually depicts the weak mental aptitude of the Shī'ah.

Third evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

A third evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not own Fadak and that the stipulation of beneficiaries was not like the injunction of zakāh from one's wealth. This proof is so adequate that it dispels any objection about why Fadak itself was not distributed. It is as follows: The revenue of land is either through its fruits or crop harvest. Consequently, the trees and crops are indirectly part of the land. This is just like how prior to plucking the fruit from a tree, the tree and the fruit on it are referred to collectively as a tree and prior to harvesting the crop the land

is referred to as land even though it has crops on it. In a similar way, *what Allah restored* also refers to the revenue of the land.

But just as how a crop has seeds and husk for example, it is then shared between human beings and cattle. in the same way, there is a partnership between Allah and the recipients in the Fay' lands, each receiving what is suitable for him because Allah has stipulated his share in the verse along with the other recipients. Therefore, since Allah is independent of food and drink, and human beings are dependent the distribution will be accordingly. The words *fuqarā'* (poor) and *masākīn* (orphans) inherently convey this meaning of dependency. The word Rasūl [also listed as a recipient] conveys the meaning of need and dependency too. Consider that the office of Nubuwwah is such an onerous responsibility that it hardly leaves any time for mundane tasks. Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ remained devoted to his task of conveying the message till he was called back by Allah. Consequently, the Prophet's ﷺ lack of material resources is evident from the word "Rasūl" itself and since he was devoted to the cause of Allah he has been listed as the first recipient.

Nevertheless, it is evident that listing all these beneficiaries in the Fay' is on account of their need. Therefore, the distribution would be as follows: The fruits and crops—which are essentially part of the land—along with the land itself would be what is referred to as *what Allah restored*. The ownership of the actual land will remain for Allah but its revenue would be distributed to the recipients due to their need.

This explanation dispels the possibility of the Prophet ﷺ having ownership of the Fay' lands and the recipients being added to it like the purpose of zakāh in one's wealth. It also dispels the objection of not distributing the actual land among the recipients.

Fourth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

Ready yourself for the fourth proof now so that any doubts that remains in the heart can be completely wiped out. The verse, *what Allah restored*, has its recipients outlined, in which there is also mention of the Prophet ﷺ. However, this does not necessitate ownership of the Prophet ﷺ because if we assume that there was ownership then the outcome (*Jazā*) which is found after the condition (*Sharṭ*) as established by the letter *fa* would be general in all the recipients resulting

in complete ownership to all the recipients in all the categories. Since, this is not so, as agreed upon by both the Sunnī and the Shī'ah, there is no reason to restrict it to only one or two of the categories of the recipients mentioned. Thus, there is no possibility of understanding the verse in a way that singles out only one or two categories for ownership. Yes, the infallibility of the Prophet ﷺ meant he would be the one to divide it; however, this does not mean he had ownership of it. On the other hand, if every category mentioned—besides Allah which is evident—are considered mere recipients (*Maṣārif*) then it would make perfect sense.

If indeed the issue was one of ownership, then the verse would have been revealed in the following manner, **For the Rasūl, for Allah, and for the near relatives**, thus establishing ownership to the Prophet ﷺ prior to mentioning the recipients. Sure, the eloquence of the Qur'ān would have then been compromised but then ownership of the fay' by the Prophet ﷺ would have been guaranteed.

Fifth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

The fifth evidence is that the personal pronoun in:

كَيْ لَا يَكُوْنَ دُوْلَةً بَيْنَ الْأَغْنِيَاءِ مِنْكُمْ

So that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you.[1]

refers to *what Allah has restored*. Therefore, the stipulation of beneficiaries is to avoid a situation where the lands of Fay' become privately owned wealth. This can only be possible if we consider the stated recipients as permanent beneficiaries to the Fay'. If it is considered the Prophet's ﷺ personal possession, then that which was being averted would inevitably come to pass. This is because if the direct descendants who inherited it initially were not affluent then the system of Allah is such that affluence or poverty is not retained perpetually in any family. Therefore, if this land were inherited then in the subsequent generation's ownership of it could come into the hands of wealthy and affluent ones.

However, confining *the rich* to rulers or affluent ones among an army has no substantiation. Yes, if this verse listing the beneficiaries was revealed to break the hopes of wealthy army officials or rulers of the era of ignorance—who consumed

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

all the booty themselves—then too the command in the verse is all-encompassing, though the situation for which the verse was revealed maybe somewhat specific. Consequently, there are hundreds of examples where a situation or incident demanded the revelation of a verse or a prophetic injunction, but the ruling was general and applicable for all. Therefore, *the rich* have to have broad connotations.

Sixth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

The beneficiaries listed in this verse, have been listed by their predominant characteristic. The Prophet ﷺ has been referred to by his position as a Rasūl, the needy, destitute and the wayfarer have been referred to with those specific characteristics as well (i.e. need, destitution, and travelling). There is no mention of identities of individuals.

This verse is then followed by the verse:

لِلْفُقَرَآءِ الْمُهٰجِرِيْنَ الَّذِيْنَ اُخْرِجُوْا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَ اَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا وَّ يَنْصُرُوْنَ اللّٰهَ وَ رَسُوْلَهٗ ؕ اُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الصّٰدِقُوْنَ

For the poor Muhājirīn who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and (His) approval and supporting Allah and His Rasūl, (there is also a share). These are those who are truthful.[1]

And:

وَ الَّذِيْنَ تَبَوَّؤُا الدَّارَ وَ الْاِيْمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّوْنَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ اِلَيْهِمْ وَ لَا يَجِدُوْنَ فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا اُوْتُوْا وَ يُؤْثِرُوْنَ عَلٰٓى اَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ ؕ وَ مَنْ يُّوْقَ شُحَّ نَفْسِهٖ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُوْنَ

And (also for) those who were settled in Madīnah (the Anṣār) and (adopted) the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts for what they (the Muhājirīn) were given but give (them) preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul — it is those who will be successful.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 9.

And then:

وَ الَّذِيْنَ جَآءُوْ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْلَنَا وَ لِاِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِيْنَ سَبَقُوْنَا بِالْاِيْمَانِ وَ لَا تَجْعَلْ فِيْ قُلُوْبِنَا غِلًّا لِّلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا رَبَّنَا اِنَّكَ رَءُوْفٌ رَّحِيْمٌ

And (these is a share for) those who came after them, saying: "Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts (any) resentment toward those who have believed. Our Rabb, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.[1]

These three subsequent verses are *badal* (alternatives) from near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller.

It is evident that these characteristics have a relationship with the Fay' and that Fay' must be dispensed in these avenues. Since land and its revenue can continue forever, and it is not something that perishes upon usage such as food, which perishes upon consumption, therefore, the beneficiaries will continue benefitting from it till the end. If not, the implication of continuity and perpetuity, which is the effect of *Jumlah Ismiyyah* would be forfeited. This is only possible if Fay' is classified as Waqf and the actual land is not distributed among the recipients.

Since the predominant characteristic of the recipients has been mentioned, the Muḥaqqiqīn maintain that the khums which is received today, the share of the Prophet ﷺ would no longer be considered, as the characteristic of risālah is not to be found any longer.

Seventh evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

It is obvious to one and all that Allah is the Supreme Owner of everything and everyone. The ownership of human beings is temporary and superficial. This is similar to a landlord owning a few homes which he has given on rent. Each tenant refers to the rented home as his home. Similarly, Allah has allowed us usage and benefit of the things given to us for some time and just like those tenants, we refer to those things as our personal belongings. Similarly, the landlord has to enter a contract with the lessee and receive rentals from him, otherwise the properties would remain in his possession. In the same way, our ownership of what has been created for our use is also dependent on a contract in order to secure it, which

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 10.

could either be purchasing, receiving it as a gift or it being handed down to one as a bequest. If not, Allah retains ownership over it.

As for the Fay' lands, the only manner to secure ownership over it was through receiving it as booty, but this option has been ruled out because Allah had given it without any battle. Therefore, the Rasūl, Dhū al-Qurbā, etc., have been stipulated as beneficiaries to determine a means for them to secure their rights over it.

Nevertheless, these seven evidences highlight why these beneficiaries would be the perpetual recipients of the revenue from Fay' (and not its owners).

Therefore, Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا claim for it establishes that she is not infallible. And even if she were infallible, infallible souls can have a misunderstanding sometimes as has been established. In this case, the reason for her misunderstanding is evident. She saw the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ administrating its affairs throughout his life and being the most devout woman, how would she know whether it was classified as Fay' or booty. Women of her calibre who have no worldly aspirations are bound to be in the dark about these material matters. More so, when the issue revolves around Fay' which is from the settlements of Khaybar.

It is evident that the nature of these settlements was diverse; some were conquered and others were secured peacefully, like Fadak. Consequently, there is a difference of opinion among the scholars about Khaybar; was it conquered or did they submit willingly.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had no personal ownership over Fadak and that the remaining recipients are not determined in the manner in which zakāh is determined as a percentage upon one's wealth. This could have been entertained if not for the attachment of Dhū al-Qurbā upon Rasūl. Therefore, since the remaining beneficiaries had no ownership, ownership cannot be concluded for the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ too.

Two difficulties in considering Dhū al-Qurbā and other recipients the owners of Fay'

Assuming that Dhū al-Qurbā and other beneficiaries are owners of Fay' then it implies that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and these beneficiaries had joint ownership over Fay'. This creates two problems; firstly, this gives unlimited people joint ownership as there is no limitation of the Dhū al-Qurbā and other beneficiaries.

Their numbers could fluctuate on a daily basis. More so if we consider, "*And (these is a share for) those who came after them, saying: "Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith,*" which includes all believers till the end of time. Secondly, booty and debts also for that matter cannot come into one's ownership unless it comes into one's possession. As for Fay' it has not come by through the efforts of the beneficiaries; it is God-given. Without assuming possession and authority over it, it remains unattached.

We can conclude that there is ample evidence suggesting that Fay' was not owned by the Prophet ﷺ. Just as how ownership is not established, the possibility of ownership is also not established. Conversely, the impossibility of ownership is manifest. This required such a lengthy deliberation from me, because though non-ownership is evident; I had to establish that the possibility of ownership is also not fathomable. Since I am debating with obtuse people, I was compelled to elaborate at length.

An objection about Waqf which stems from the verse, "And those your right hand possesses"

It should be noted that *what Allah restored* is general, which includes movable and immovable property. Therefore, if *what Allah restored* attains the classification of Waqf, then it includes movables, and this creates two problems. Firstly, the Ḥanafī school of thought maintain that movables cannot be classified as Waqf. Secondly, movables from the Fay' were never classified as Waqf and it was always considered personal property according to the unanimous view of scholars. Consequently, these movables were bought, sold and owned, indicating that these movables of Fay' were not Waqf. This is evident from the fact that the Prophet ﷺ distributed the arms and weapons from the Fay' of Banū Naḍīr among the Ṣaḥābah, with no hint of it being Waqf property in any way.

In fact, there is clear testimony of this in the Qur'ān which is supreme evidence. Consider the following verse:

وَمَا مَلَكَتْ يَمِيْنُكَ مِمَّا اَفَآءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْكَ

And those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you (of captives).[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 50.

This means: O Nabī, we have made lawful for you those bondswomen whom you have received through the Fay' which Allah has handed over to you.

Consequently, it is evident from this verse that the slaves (movables) from Fay' are not classified as Waqf, they can be owned. Therefore, if one item of the Waqf can be owned it creates an objection about the interpretation that we have given to *what Allah restored* and the beneficiaries listed there.

It must, therefore, be determined what the true nature of the Fay' is; if it is Waqf, then all of it must be classified as Waqf and if it is not Waqf then movables and non-movables must be given the same classification.

Response to this objection

Firstly, we do accept that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah does not consider the Waqf of movables to be valid. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is not subjected to taqlīd of the view of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. The worst-case scenario is that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has erred, and the Ahl al-Sunnah have never claimed that their Imām is infallible. Instead, they maintain that a Mujtahid errs and he deduces correctly, but his correct rulings overwhelm his errors. Therefore, it is possible that he has erred and why not? Ṣāḥibayn—his two students[1]—maintain that Waqf of movables is valid. Ṣāḥibayn are also Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and if the Shīʿah would have followed them instead of people like al-Ṭūsī, al-Raḍī, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and Abū al-Qāsim then it would have been their good fortune.

However, what if the Qur'ānic verse supports Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's view after all? Let us elaborate on this but please do not be biased and listen carefully if you really wish to know how it justifies Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's view. Consequently, the verses preceding this which commence from:

هُوَ الَّذِیْ اَخْرَجَ الَّذِیْنَ كَفَرُوْا مِنْ اَهْلِ الْكِتٰبِ مِنْ دِیَارِهِمْ لِاَوَّلِ الْحَشْرِ

It is He who expelled the ones who disbelieved among the People of the Scripture from their homes at the first gathering.

Till:

1 Imām Muḥammad and Imām Abū Yūsuf.

مَا قَطَعْتُمْ مِّنْ لِّيْنَةٍ اَوْ تَرَكْتُمُوْهَا قَآئِمَةً عَلٰى اُصُوْلِهَا فَبِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ وَ لِيُخْزِىَ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ

Whatever you have cut down of (their) palm trees or left standing on their trunks, it was by permission of Allah and so He would disgrace the defiantly disobedient.[1]

establishes that *what Allah restored* refers to homes and vacant lands. Therefore, only immovables are implied by *what Allah restored*, not movables. Now despite the word *Mā* (what) having a general all-encompassing connotation, it has been qualified by the passage preceding it and this occurs very commonly in Arabic usage (i.e. the confinement of *Mā* to specific things). Children studying the primary text of *al-Kāfiyah* understand that in the sentence:

الاسم ما دل على معنى

Mā refers to a word.

This is why Mawlānā Jāmī explains that *Mā* refers to a word in *Sharḥ Mullā.*

This establishes that *what Allah restored* refers to immovables only, not both movables and immovable. Subsequently the phrase, "so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you," also supports this because perpetual distribution is only possible in something that remains intact and this cannot be the case with movables as it is subject to wear and tear and perishing through consumption. Whilst some movables may have some lifespan, the possibility of perpetual distribution cannot be visualised as the verse, "And those who came after them, saying: 'Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith,'" extends the beneficiaries till the end of time. In this case, surely only immovables like land can survive that duration of time and only it can be subjected to perpetual distribution.

Therefore, *what Allah restored* does not include movables and there is no objection against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحِمَهُ اللّٰهُ.

An unanswered question

If *what Allah restored* does not include the movables acquired through Fay' then what would its classification be. Would it be classified as Waqf, like Fay', or would it

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 2-5.

be possible to have ownership like that which is acquired as booty? In my humble opinion it would be possible and the recipient would have ownership. If anyone can prove otherwise, then I would be more than happy to accept their view.

Allow me to substantiate my view; Waqf is usually something where the actual item remains and it is then utilised (without the actual thing perishing). Therefore, the actual item remains and its benefits are dispensed or utilised by beneficiaries.

Movables Such as Food and Crops Cannot Be Classified as Waqf

Since the Waqf item and its benefits are two separate entities the word *for Allah* along with the other recipients listed in Fay' is valid because the actual thing remains in the ownership of Allah, whilst the beneficiaries enjoy its revenue. As for benefits of Waqf, it is something that does not have long-lasting endurance.

Consider edible items—which are movable—and which are one of the benefits derived from Waqf land. Benefits in our discussion here refer to that which is not worthy of utilising again once it has been benefited from; instead it is consumable and perishable. Therefore, food perishes once consumed.

Besides food which is perishable, other movable items—received as Fay'—could include clothing, conveyances etc. Clothing and perishables from one perspective can be considered like immovables because in the case of conveyances, the animal is one entity and the benefits derived from it such as riding it and making a journey easy are a separate matter. Similarly, a garment is one entity and the benefit of wearing it to protect oneself from cold or heat is a separate matter.

But if this perspective is considered than almost every other item of human use could be defined in the same way. Therefore, bread is an entity and its ability to nourish and sustain is a separate issue. However, this perspective does not entitle it to being classified as Waqf. Had this been so, then just as how land is made Waqf, the harvest of it would also have been made Waqf, but this is not valid according to anyone. Waqf demands that the actual item be retained and that it be imperishable whilst its benefits are distributed to beneficiaries. In the case of food, the actual item perishes. Therefore, if grains and crops were classified as Waqf, then just as the Fay' lands were Waqf, these would also have been Waqf and it would not have been possible for the recipients to sell it or give it as hibah, or that it be inherited from them or bequeathed (which are the rules of Waqf) but none prohibits them from this.

Therefore, crops are classified purely as benefits. The benefits of Waqf — when given to the recipients is classified as charity and they then become its owners. They are then permitted to sell it or do as they like. So, if someone wishes to consider crops and harvest as a Waqf item, then let them do so. In this instance the discussion revolves around the crops of the lands of Fay' which is the Waqf of Allah Taʿālā and these crops unanimously cannot be Waqf otherwise the recipients would not receive it.

Conveyances and clothing cannot be considered Waqf items

As for clothing and conveyances, if anyone does make any distinction between this and crops then it would only be that crops perish upon consumption whilst clothing and conveyances do not perish [instantly] upon usage. But if we reflect closely, this is just like the case of a loaf of bread; if one slice is eaten the remaining is still available. Similarly, benefitting from clothing and conveyances brings gradual decay despite these not perishing instantly. That is why it is seen that those animals which are used for riding and carrying burdens are noticeably weaker and leaner than animals that are left free. Clothing also wears out gradually with each cycle of wash and wear.

Nevertheless, items of benefit perish instantly or gradually, whereas that which exists absolutely, such as land, it is not perishable. This is evidently the reason why Imām Abū Ḥanīfah considered the Waqf of movables invalid. Ṣāḥibayn and those who maintain that view have considered these movables as Waqf, on account of the temporary existence of the item—which differs from item to item—but the above explanation accords merit to the view of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Deliberation of Ṣāḥibayn's stance regarding Waqf of movables

If we disregard the above discussion, then the stance of Ṣāḥibayn seems to be correct since, firstly, the benefits derived from clothes, conveyances, and other necessary items of life are—according to our idiomatic usage—assigned to the items themselves. Further, as long as they remain in their forms of utility, they are not assigned to their substance. which gradually decays with use.

Secondly, just as every human is considered a separate entity in relation to rest of humanity, the different benefits derived from clothing and conveyances are considered separate entities in their own right. Thus, if some of the entities—

humans or benefits—cease to exist it does not translate into the entire species becoming non-existent. Therefore, if at some point, some benefits are lost, it does not mean the principle benefit is lost. And since the existence of its various benefits relies on only the existence of the principle item, why would Waqf of the said items not be possible?

This is unlike the benefit gained through food items since such benefit eats into itself. For example, the benefit gained from half a slice of bread is half of what could be attained from one slice.

The stance of Ṣāḥibayn helps our cause too

If the stance of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is taken, then it is quite obvious that movable property cannot be classified as Waqf from fay' nor can it be classified as Waqf. Though, if the stance of Ṣāḥibayn is taken then too our cause does not fail. To grasp this, consider the principle in the greatest necessity of human life; food. Every other movable wealth is secondary to it. All secondary items are in fact a means to attain this principle wealth of food. Now, Waqf is a mechanism instituted to alleviate need, and the only true need is that of food. Thus, there has to be a necessity of food for those on the receiving end of Waqf from fay', albeit not from other types of Waqf.

It is therefore understood that the objective of the Waqf from fay' is alleviating need through food. This is further cemented by the indications of the Qur'ān wherein Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى used words such as *Rasūl*, *Masākīn*, *Fuqarā'*, and *Ibn Sabīl*. The second and third demographic has the innate distinguishing mark of poverty, i.e. lack of food. The other words describe personas of the same standing. In the word 'Rasūl' this meaning is found in the sense that the Messenger is sent with a particular task in which he expands all his energies due to which he has no time to spend in attaining a livelihood. The livelihood of the Messenger is thus the responsibility of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى. As far as orphans and travellers are concerned, due to them being detached from sources of income, here too the meaning of poverty is found. Consequently, in all the categories poverty is found to some degree.

Waqf of movable items is of no benefit to the poor

If they are given movable items than they can either benefit from it by using it to earn a living, for example, by using a conveyance as a means of transportation hire

or by selling the item received. However, selling items of Waqf is not permissible and as such instead of the items alleviating their need, it can become a burden for them to bear. Further both options don't guarantee an immediate return for their immediate need. Taking these issues into consideration, Waqf of movable items is of no use to the poor. This viewpoint serves to strengthens the viewpoint of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Some immovable items give long term recurring benefit

Immovable items such as houses and lands similarly may not provide immediate solutions to the immediate need of the poor. However, there remains a distinct difference between this and movable items based on which the latter cannot be inferred from the former.

Firstly, benefits attained from movable items are not perpetual as opposed to land and property which can be always utilized to farm crops. Additionally, if nothing is grown and reaped from the land at present, it does not affect the land being instituted as Waqf. It will remain within this designation even if not utilized in the manner it was endowed for. This is similar to a masjid which lays abandoned. Even though no ṣalāh takes place there at this moment it still remains within its designation of endowment as long as the possibility of it being utilized for it remains.

Secondly, though the need for food is a principle need, this does not negate the principle need for housing which is as important. Waqf of a land provides the stability of food, land, and housing, issues that are severely lacking from the Waqf of movable items.

A linguistic discussion on "Those your right hand possesses"

It has become quite evident that the verse, "*those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you,*" is not against our standpoint at all. Rather, it accords merit to our view as the particle *min* (from) in *mimā* (from what) shows *Tabʿīḍ* (partitivity).

Accordingly, two issues come to the fore. Firstly, the Prophet ﷺ was not privy to ownership of the **entire** fay' and secondly, the portion of which 'ownership' was afforded to him was as an administrator not as a titleholder. If not, he would have

had singular ownership of the entire fay' since the reason of its incorporation was singular.

The word *Yamīnuka* (your right hand) carries a similar connotation. If ownership of the entire fay' before distribution was intended, there was no need to specify *Yamīnuka* (your right hand). The pronoun in *Malakta* (you own) would have sufficed.

The nature of the Prophet's ﷺ portion from the fay'

It is clear that the Prophet ﷺ was not the owner before possession; however, the question of having a right in it—like that of a creditor in borrowed wealth and the warrior in booty—remains. Did the Prophet ﷺ have such right in the wealth of fay'? Or was the relationship with the fay' similar to the relationship of the poor in relation to the wealth of the rich in which they enjoy no such right whereby they can lay any claim? The Prophet's ﷺ relation with the wealth of fay' was like of the latter group, he was simply a beneficiary, worthy of receiving a share from it.

There are two types of claims. *Istiḥqāq Qawī* (strong claims) which are also known as *Istiḥqāq Fiʿlī*, *Istiḥqāq Shakṣī*, or *Istiḥqāq Ḥaqīqī*. And *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) which are also known as *Istiḥqāq Infiʿālī*, *Istiḥqāq Nawʿī*, or *Istiḥqāq Majāzī*.

In *Istiḥqāq Qawī* (strong claims) the claimant has a tangible existent claim (*Amr Wujūdī*) which serves as the basis for his claim. In the issue of debts, this is self-evident. Even in booty it is quite clear since jihād is a positively existent concept, which is probably the reason why attaining booty has been attributed to the slave instead of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ—though all in reality is from Allah—in the following verse by use of the applicable pronoun:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِّنْ شَيْءٍ

*And know that anything **you** obtain of war booty...*[1]

On the other hand, in *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) there is poverty or insolvency, both concepts that are positively non-existent (*Amr ʿAdmī*) which cannot serve as a tangible prospect to lay claim to. That is why a rich person will not be considered

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 41.

an oppressor by the merely not giving wealth to an insolvent person. Yes, if he doesn't fulfil his religious obligations, he will be sinful, as he has not fulfilled the right of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى; however, the insolvent person cannot demand anything from him. This point is further driven by the fact that when discharging the religious obligation of zakāt, one is not obliged to give to every category mentioned in the verse outlining the various categories of recipients.

The categories of recipients are formulated on the basis of poverty

If, for arguments sake, we say that due to insolvency one is obligated to give, then to give all insolvent people would have been necessary. However, since this is not the case, is it also not necessary to give to every category. Poverty in most of the categories is self-evident, though in the *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb*[1] and the *ʿĀmilīn*[2] it is not.

The answer to this is that in the case of the latter, *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb*, they distribute it amongst the poor and as such it is just like giving to the poor. In the former giving them would result in a general increase of alms and in relation to them this was a kind of transaction. In the early days the Muslims were few and some of those who had accepted Islam did not have firm faith. A share was allocated to them which the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ would give to them; this resulted in the entrenchment of their faith. When a person receives from another, the love of the one giving is embedded into the heart of the one that receives. Through this method of giving the *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb* the love of the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ was embedded into their hearts which is the essence of faith. Since after the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ the number of Muslims increased manifold, this category became obsolete.

To summarize, in *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) the recipients right is positively non-existent (*Amr ʿAdmī*), due to which they cannot lay a claim. Yes, the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى is an *Amr Wujūdī* (existent right) which brings forth an obligation, therefore Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى can take one to task for non-fulfilment. The above demonstrates that poverty and insolvency merely allows for being on the receiving end which is equal amongst all the categories, thus anyone from the categories given will do.

---

1 Those who have just recently embraced Islam and are still weak in faith; they may be given Zakāh so as bring their hearts closer to Islam.

2 Those appointed to collect the Zakāh, they are also considered as valid recipients on account of the effort they make in collecting.

Understanding this, it becomes clear that the Prophet ﷺ did not have a right that rested on an Amr Wujūdī in relation to the wealth of fay'. There was no debt owed to him by the disbelievers nor did they make any bequests for him. There was a possibility of it being *ghanīmah*; however, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ rejected this notion with the following verse:

وَمَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ رَسُولِهِ مِنْهُمْ فَمَا أَوْجَفْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ خَيْلٍ وَلَا رِكَابٍ
وَلَٰكِنَّ اللَّهَ يُسَلِّطُ رُسُلَهُ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَاللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger from them, you did not spur for it [in an expedition] any horses or camels, but Allah gives His Messengers power over whom He wills, and Allah is over all things competent.[1]

The right that the Prophet ﷺ had in relation to the fay' was then no doubt *Istiḥqāq Ḍa'īf* (weak claim) which is also the reason Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ attributed its procurement to Himself and not to the servants by the wording *and what Allah restored*.

Based on this the majority view of the scholars is that after the passing of the Prophet ﷺ his right to the fay' had fallen away. The Shī'ah, who opine that his right had been inherited by the Imāms have based their opinion on conjecture with no proof signifying the same.

A linguistic discussion on from what Allah has returned to you

If the word *Afā'* (restored) in the verse is taken in its technical meaning to mean fay' then there are two possibilities. Either the preposition *min* (from) in *mimā* (from that) implies *Tab'īḍ* (partitivity) or it implies *Tabyīn* (clarification). If we take it to imply partitivity, it is evidently in our favour as already discussed. On the other hand, if we take it to imply clarification—which is far-fetched considering the context—then too it would not be against our understanding.

This discussion emerges only when considering its technical meaning. If, however, we consider its literal meaning then it would merely imply the returning or restoring by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ of His property from the disbelievers to the administration of the

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6.

Prophet ﷺ. In such a case, there is no reason to consider the 'ownership' of the Prophet ﷺ as returning or restoring of wealth in its literal meaning. This is the same in fay' and ghanīmah.

Determining the meaning of fay'

The use of *Afā'* (restored) in the Qur'ān is in two places; in Sūrah al-Ḥashr and in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb. Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before Sūrah al-Ḥashr as is explicitly mentioned in *al-Itqān* under the discussion of the order of chapter revelation. The technical meaning of fay' implies the procurement of property with no fight or battle as understood from you did not spur for it. If this was already included in the implication of *Afā'* (restored) then there was no need for stating *you did not spur for it*, and since the word came into vogue the whole concept was shortened to just the word fay'. The point being, that since the verse in Sūrah al-Ḥashr, which is the origin of the technical term, is meant in its literal meaning, the verse that was revealed before it in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb would also be in its literal meaning.

By the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ the issues pertaining to the verse, *And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger*, has been explained in detail. As a result, any person of high or low intellect will understand that Fadak was not the property of the Prophet ﷺ and it could not have been given as a gift nor could it have been inherited. Another detail that has become glaringly obvious is that the narrations of the Shī'ah regarding the Fadak Estate are nothing more than lies and fabrications. It is impossible to conceive that the Prophet ﷺ would gift someone from property that did not belong to him.

Continued misunderstanding of the Qur'ān by the Prophet ﷺ is an impossibility

The idea that the Prophet ﷺ misunderstood the laws of the Qur'ān is absurd. If the Prophet ﷺ did not have deep insight into the Qur'ān, then who would? How can it be that simpletons like us understand the inferences of the Qur'ān and the Prophet ﷺ doesn't? Sure, if the Shī'ah want to believe such then so be it. Yes, if it was a lay person of the Ummah one could say he had made a mistake in understanding the verses, but it is impossible that the Prophet ﷺ would make a mistake and then not be counselled by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ.

If—for arguments sake—we assume that the Prophet ﷺ was under the impression that the Fadak estate was not part of the fay', rather his property and so he mistakenly gifted it then it would have been necessary for revelation to come down, correct this misstep, and return the Fadak Estate.

The verse, And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger, is a Mukhaṣṣiṣ of the verse, Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all)

Though for the Shīʿah they don't even have to go through the trouble of hypothetical scenarios as they believe in the doctrine of Badā', i.e. that Allah can make a mistake [Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ save us from such folly].

In any case, there is no way that gifting of the Fadak Estate was possible, ergo Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا owning it is also an impossibility. In order to gift something, one must first own the item. Based on this, it is clear that inheriting the Fadak Estate was also not possible.

Another issue that comes to the fore is that *if* the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies to the Prophet ﷺ and to others equally then too no finger can be pointed to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as the verse *And what Allah restored* qualifies it and expounds on the wealth of fay'—in which the Fadak Estate is also included—as well as the position of the Prophet ﷺ in relation to it.

The Fadak Estate is not included in Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all)

After an analysis of the verses it becomes clear that there is no need to qualify one with the other. When qualifying one verse with another the implication is that the laws derived from them are similar; however, this is not the case here. *If Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies to and includes the inheritance of the Prophet ﷺ as well, then it would apply to that inheritance which he was the owner of as the laws of inheritance applies to that which one has ownership of. Since, the Fadak Estate was an endowment it did not fall under the ambit of ownership. Therefore, it does not fall under the laws of the verse under discussion. Further, if this verse was not present then we would have to look for a qualifier (*Mukhaṣṣiṣ*) which is found in the narration:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity.

However, it is clear that we are not in need of a qualifier since it was not under ownership that it be governed by the laws of inheritance.

Additionally, there are other examples where this verse has been qualified. For instance, a disbeliever will not inherit, a slave will not inherit, and a murderer will not inherit. These exclusions are not by other verses of the Qur'ān, rather it is by the aḥādīth. Since this is the case then what is the matter with accepting the narration, *what we leave behind is charity*, as a qualifier? Thus, even if the verse, *And what Allah restored*, is not considered, this narration will serve as a qualifier. Such qualifying does not signal a contradiction, though if such qualifying is termed as a contradiction by some then such 'contradiction' is accepted by both the Sunnī and the Shīʿah.

True contradiction of the sources by the Shīʿah

Not giving inheritance to the grandchildren of the deceased in the presence of the parents—as the Shīʿah opine—is contradictory in the true sense. The grandchildren form part of the children without a shadow of doubt. And since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ instructs inheritance in favour of the children, the grandchildren are also included therein. If the Shīʿah require evidence for the grandchildren being part of the children, then they should consider the verse of *Mubāhalah* which by consensus of both the Sunnī and the Shīʿah refers to Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and others رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Here is the verse in reference:

فَمَنْ حَاجَّكَ فِيهِ مِن بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ فَقُلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَكُمْ وَنِسَاءَنَا وَنِسَاءَكُمْ وَأَنْفُسَنَا وَأَنْفُسَكُمْ ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ فَنَجْعَل لَّعْنَتَ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِيْنَ

Then whoever argues with you about it after [this] knowledge has come to you, say, "Come, let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves, then supplicate earnestly [together] and invoke the curse of Allah upon the liars [among us]."[1]

More evidence of this is the many instances of the Qur'ān proclaiming:

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 61.

يَا بَنِيْ إِسْرَائِيْلَ

O Children of Israel.

By which the children of Yaʿqūb are meant. It is clear that none of the children of Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ were present during its revelation to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, rather it was his far descendants but here to the word *children* is used.

Another contradiction of theirs is that they opine that the wife will not receive inheritance from the land or from the value of the land. Similarly, maternal brothers and sisters will not receive inheritance from blood money. Further, a murderer will receive inheritance from the inheritance and blood money of the murdered in the case of an accidental killing.

All this is in stark contrast to the dictates of the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān speaks with generality regarding the inheritance of the wife, brothers, and sisters with no exception of inheritance from lands. Similarly, the narration states, "The murderer will not inherit". The purport of the narration is general without exception, be it pre-meditated or accidental.

More contradictions are found in the form of the eldest son receiving the muṣḥaf, ring, and other items of the deceased. Regarding this practice, the Shīʿah present narrations that outline the actions of their Imāms in as far as them not including it in the inheritance. Firstly, these narrations are narrated by only Shīʿah reporters and secondly it totally contradicts the Qur'ānic injunctions. If they present the excuse of the infallibility of their Imāms, well, we only accept infallibility of the Prophets.

Explicit direction is worthy of following, whilst actions have the possibility of a distinct standalone law

Instruction by way of spoken word is prioritised over following the actions of even an infallible since there is a possibility that the act is unique to the infallible. Consider the tens of laws that are unique to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, for example, he was not restricted to four marriages and he was permitted to fast continuously whereas others were not allowed either. In an instruction by way of spoken word there is no such ambiguity.

Since the Shīʿah opine the actions of their 'infallible' Imāms are to be followed then what of the direct speech of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Should priority not be

given to that? The narration which states, "Our property will not be inherited, what we leave is ṣadaqah" is worthier of following based on the above discussion alone. Over and above that, the status of the Imāms is nowhere close to that of the Prophet ﷺ.

Another point of note is that the narration, "We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from," is an explanation of the verses of the Qur'ān that deal with inheritance. Sure, it can be understood to be a qualifier; however, recognizing it as an explanation makes even more sense. On the other hand, the Shīʿah narration neither serves as a qualifier nor as an explanation. It is a complete contradiction. It also holds no weight in comparison to the narration of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Even so, they consider their narration worthy of being a qualifier, then what is the issue with considering the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as such due to which he did not hand over the Fadak Estate? He heard this narration directly from the Prophet ﷺ, and did not pass judgment based on a foreign legal system!

If we disregard both the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and the Shīʿah narration and only look at the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) in the light of *ʿaql* (logic) and *naql* (reports) it becomes abundantly clear which side would be weightier.

In any case, holding the Shīʿah accountable to every view of theirs is tiring. I am weary of constantly embarrassing them and I feel disinclined to keep refuting their falsities. If one reads these pages with impartiality, he will no doubt realise that there would be many other such absurdities of the Shīʿah.

Nevertheless, since certainty results in ease, the remainder of Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter will also be considered and answered so that there remains no doubt of the reasons of its ludicrousness. Though my tasks at hand are many and I do not have much time, I find myself continuing with this effort. Thus, objections to the narration:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity.

and to the verse:

فَهَبْ لِيْ مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِيْ وَيَرِثُ مِنْ اٰلِ يَعْقُوْبَ

> *So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.*[1]

and the verse:

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُوْدَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[2]

Will be answered appropriately.

Another point to consider is that since we now know that the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies only to the Ummah and not to the Prophet ﷺ the ḥadīth in reference is not even needed. There is no question of inheritance in the wealth of the Prophet ﷺ since he is not included in the ambit of this statute. To drive the point further the verse, *And what Allah restored*, establishes that the Fadak Estate was not even under his ownership. Thus, in reality there remains no argument. Now, even if someone establishes that the laws of inheritance apply to the Prophet ﷺ then too it would not apply to the Fadak Estate. For inheritance to occur there must be prior ownership.

Even if the narration, "We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from," is not acceptable, it has no bearing on the Fadak Estate

If by the apparent contradiction of the narration and the verse, the narration is not acceptable then too it has no bearing on the Fadak Estate. Because firstly, the Prophet ﷺ is already excluded from the purport of verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) by way of indication. If we assume that there was inheritance in the wealth of the other Prophets then so be it, our discussion revolves around the inheritance of the Prophet ﷺ. By token of the non-acceptance of the narration the Fadak Estate still cannot be considered for inheritance. Yes, if the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) is rejected then a case may be built.

Secondly, even if the estate of the Prophet ﷺ were to be tied up according to the common law of inheritance, then too the issue at hand, the Fadak Estate, will not be included therein due to the purport of the verse *And what Allah restored*. If

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

the Shīʿah then want to reject this verse too and drag themselves out of the fold of Islam, then let them do so.

Nonetheless, the ruling issued by Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in not handing over the Fadak Estate was in complete conformity to the Prophetic teachings. We have no need to establish conformity between the aforementioned verses and narrations nor do we need to answer any apparent contradiction.

This entire issue is resolved by the tone of address in the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and the indication in the verse *And what Allah restored*.

Determining the Nature of the Inheritance of the Ambiyā'

In order to establish the veracity and credibility of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ it is essential to elaborate on this matter too. However, I will firstly deliberate on the issue of contradiction between the ḥadīth regarding the possessions of the Ambiyā' not being subjected to inheritance and the apparent conflict with the verse:

فَهَبْ لِيْ مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِيْ وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوْبَ

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[1]

Firstly, does the term *Yarithu* (inherit from) refer to wealth, on account of which this verse is said to oppose the ḥadīth transmitted by Ṣiddīq al-Akbar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ. Secondly, *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) could refer to its actual meaning or a metaphoric meaning. If it is in the metaphorical context, then *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) refers to Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ himself; and this is common in Arabic dialogue where *Āl* of so and so actually refers to that particular person. Or is *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) actually referring to the apparent meaning (i.e. the family of Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ).

Therefore, if the metaphorical context is implied then it would mean that the estate of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was not distributed for a period of over 2000 years and that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ knew that it would be distributed before his demise. But if this wealth was going to be distributed after his prayer and before his demise then there was no need to add the words *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb); instead *Yarithunī* (inherit me) was adequate since Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ would inherit directly from Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. Therefore, this part of the verse would be meaningless.

Nevertheless, this implies that Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ left this world over 2000 years ago and his Estate remained undistributed despite having so many relatives and heirs in this lengthy period. This surely does not make sense, unless of course it appeals to foolish minds.

If the literal meaning of *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) is meant, then it implies that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was the sole inheritor of the entire wealth of each and every

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

individual of the Banī Isrā'īl despite them numbering hundreds of thousands of individuals. It also implies that he enjoyed such familial ties with each one of them on account of which he would be the inheritor of his estate. Thirdly, it implies that every individual of the Banī Isrā'īl should expire before Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and leave no dependants so that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ could inherit everything as suggested by *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb). Therefore, this implication is more absurd and preposterous that the first one.

Therefore, both implications are impossible and they do not make sense at all. Why would Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ—being a Nabī of Allah—make such a statement and why would Allah record such meaningless words in the Qur'ān, which is unparalleled in eloquence?

It is possible that someone may challenge what we have said above by saying that *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) does not necessarily refer to every individual of the progeny of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. However, if the text was: *Min* ***Kulli Wāḥid min*** *Āl Yaʿqūb* (**from every one of them** of the family of Yaʿqūb) it would have referred to each and every individual of this progeny and then this could have been a valid objection. But the intelligent understand that if *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) only referred to one or two individuals then what was the need to even mention this when *Yarithunī* (inherit me) was adequate? In addition to this *Āl* in Arabic dialogue refers to the entire group without exclusion of any individual.

Therefore, the Shīʿah deduction of inheritance from the Ambiyā' taken from this verse and subsequent criticism of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for transmitting the ḥadīth which is in conflict with this, is like the case of someone whose nose has been cut off, and he mocks at those who have noses. When the scholars of this group are steeped in such ignorance then what would be the condition of the laity.

Similarly, Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ mentions two words in his prayer; *Walī* (heir) and *Yarithunī* (inherit me). If *Walī* refers to a son, then *Yarithunī* (inherit me) is redundant because the son inevitably will be the inheritor. But if they say that he added *Yarithunī* (inherit me) to avoid his son doing one of two actions which would make him forfeit his father's inheritance, such as reverting from Islam or taking his father's life, then there is still no need for adding *Yarithunī* (inherit me) because the words, *And make him, My Rabb, pleasing (to You)*, comes further on, and takes care of this apprehension.

As for saying that he added *Yarithunī* (inherit me) so that the child would not die before him, then this is a possibility that could only be entertained by those who have no knowledge of Allah. The fact that he sought a successor on account of him fearing the successors after him, implies that the son should succeed him. Similarly, the term *Walī* itself refers to a successor and inevitably he must live on after the demise of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

Putting all these absurdities aside for a moment, there is enough evidence to prove that the inheritance of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was not material possessions because if it was material possessions then it tarnishes his image as a Nabī of Allah. Was he so covetous of wealth that he went to such lengths to preserve it for his son even though he could not get possession of it in his own lifetime? Did love for wealth actually make him ask for a son who could enjoy it? Such characteristics are associated with lovers of this world, not the Ambiyā' of Allah.

The Shī'ah are not content on criticising Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; they have surpassed that to the level whereby the Ambiyā' are not even spared. Who can comprehend the level of the Ambiyā', before whom the world and its contents are not more than camel or goat droppings? Furthermore, Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ—with his unique position of austerity—would he go to these limits to secure a trivial portion of this worldly possessions? And would he put this matter before Allah, listing all the reasons why his supplications desperately need to be responded to?

Similarly, he adds:

وَإِنِّي خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِيَ مِن وَرَائِي

And indeed, I fear the successors after me.[1]

To enhance the urgency of his supplication so that there is no delay in response. Subḥān Allāh! This surely cannot be a Nabī, it must be the aspirations of worldly people. In fact, those who are steeped in love of this world also do not have such far-fetched ambitions. If Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ apprehended that his relatives would squander his wealth after his demise and this prompted him to say, "I fear the successors after me," then this does not make sense because he is not responsible or answerable for their actions after he has left this world. If he really had this

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5.

fear, he could have spent all his wealth for the sake of Allah, so that it would not be owned by corrupt relatives and he would accrue rewards for that. If his son was righteous and he spent it in the cause of Allah, then these rewards would be for his son, not him.

However, the thought of still living on and being dependant on his wealth could have deterred him from spending it all for the sake of Allah. So, if lack of patience and failing to adopt *tawakkul* (reliance on Allah) despite being a Nabī deterred him from giving his wealth away in noble causes, then it is a fact that Ambiyā' do not leave this world without consenting to return to Allah. Therefore, he could have given it away when the notice of death came along and this would have protected it from corrupt relatives.

The conclusion to this entire discussion is that "inherit" in this verse cannot by any means refer to wealth and material possessions.

The inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُوْدَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[1]

In a similar manner, logic demands that the inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, which was received by Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام cannot be material possessions. However, if the Shī'ah do not see the logic, then it is a valid excuse.

Consequently, historians are unanimous that Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام had nineteen sons. If it were material possessions to be inherited, then all nineteen were equally entitled. The verse which says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام implies that he was the sole inheritor, to the exclusion of the remaining eighteen. This cannot be valid. Similarly, when inheritance must pass on from father to son, then what is the purpose of saying this? Such interpretations render the word of Allah meaningless.

Similarly, since the discussion in this chapter revolves around the merits of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام what merit is highlighted in saying that he inherited from his father when all sons—pious or impious—inherit from their father's wealth.

---

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

Therefore, inheritance cannot refer to wealth and material possessions. It must now be ascertained what the inheritance of the Ambiyā' is, because in the light of the above two verses it surely cannot be wealth and material possessions. In order to solve this, we first refer to the 'infallible' Imāms and see what they say on this matter. We receive the following response from them:

ان سليمان ورث داود و ان محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ورث سليمان

> Verily Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd, and Muḥammad inherited from Sulaymān.

Al-Kulaynī records the above narration on the authority of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Had the Ahl al-Sunnah recorded such statements then the Shīʿah could have objected. Nevertheless, it is established that the inheritance in this case refers to knowledge and Nubuwwah, because there was no blood relation between the Prophet ﷺ and Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام. Similarly, if it was wealth, then when did the Prophet ﷺ receive it? Therefore, the inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام to Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام was knowledge and Nubuwwah, and this is the same two which the Prophet ﷺ received.

The context of this verse

The context of this verse and the verses before and after it clarify that inheritance refers to knowledge and Nubuwwah, not wealth. Any ḥāfiẓ, who knows basic Arabic, is aware of this; but I will record it for the benefit of others. Consequently, the verse before this is:

وَلَقَدْ اٰتَيْنَا دَاوٗدَ وَ سُلَيْمٰنَ عِلْمًا وَ قَالَا الْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ الَّذِيْ فَضَّلَنَا عَلٰى كَثِيْرٍ مِّنْ عِبَادِهِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

> *And we had certainly given to Dāwūd and Sulaymān knowledge, and they said, "Praise (is due) to Allah, who has favoured us over many of His believing servants."*[1]

If this verse is joined with the next verse, it implies that Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام and Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام received knowledge from Allah. They thanked Allah on account of being favoured over many of His creation by virtue of this knowledge.

---

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 15.

The next verse says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and he said to the people:

وَ قَالَ يٰۤاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ عُلِّمْنَا مَنْطِقَ الطَّيْرِ وَ اُوْتِيْنَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَیْءٍ اِنَّ هٰذَا لَهُوَ الْفَضْلُ الْمُبِيْنُ

He said, "O people, we have been taught the language of birds, and we have been given from all things. Indeed, this is evident bounty."

Now consider that *Wa Waritha* (he inherited) is attached to "*And we had certainly given to Dāwūd*" and the verse "*He said, "O people we have been taught*" is attached to "And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd". Since all are inter-connected and related to one another, it necessarily implies that *Wa Waritha* (he inherited) refers to knowledge, not wealth. Had this verse not been connected to each other then they would not have been attached to each other (by the conjunction "*waw*"). Those who have studied the discussion on *faṣl* and *waṣl* in the books, *Muṭawwal* and *Mukhtaṣar al-Maʿānī*, know well that the conjunction would not have featured if these were not interconnected. Therefore, the three sentences are connected and inheritance refers to nothing else but knowledge. Those who are familiar with the Qur'ān know that this is the case in many instances, but the Shīʿah are to be excused for ignorance of the Qur'ān.

Consider the following examples where inheritance can refer to nothing but knowledge:

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

ثُمَّ أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِيْنَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا

Then we caused to inherit the Book those We have chosen of Our servants.[1]

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى also says:

فَخَلَفَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ خَلْفٌ وَّرِثُوا الْكِتٰبَ

But there followed them successors who inherited the Scripture...[2]

1 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 32.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

The first verse means that we have given the book as inheritance to those of our servants whom we have chosen. The second verse also pertains to inheritance of the Book, i.e. knowledge.

However, it is possible that some foolish Shīʿī might consider the Book to be wealth (on account of its monetary value), and thereby deduce that inheritance refers to wealth. Whilst such an assumption is laughable and responding to it may be ridiculous but taking the level of understanding of the Shīʿah, it is inevitable.

Therefore, consider that the first verse is followed by the classification of people in three groups, i.e. "among them is he who wrongs himself, etc." The second verse is followed by:

يَاْخُذُوْنَ عَرَضَ هٰذَا الْاَدْنٰى

(while) taking the commodities of this life.

In the former case, "of our servants" establishes that the classification of people is in relation to them complying with the Book and following its teachings. Thus, some were oppressive to themselves, others, moderate and some excelled by the grace of Allah. This classification can only apply if inheritance refers to knowledge, not the monetary value of the binding and pages of the Book.

Similarly, *(while) taking the commodities of this life*—which follows on from the second verse—establishes that instead of holding on to the Book, they sold its teachings for trivial worldly gain and accepted bribery. This is supported by:

اَلَمْ يُؤْخَذْ عَلَيْهِمْ مِّيْثَاقُ الْكِتٰبِ اَنْ لَّا يَقُوْلُوْا عَلَى اللّٰهِ اِلَّا الْحَقَّ وَدَرَسُوْا مَا فِيْهِ ؕ

Was not the covenant of the Scripture taken from them that they would not say about Allah except the truth, and they studied what was in it.[1]

Consequently, they received bribes for selling knowledge, which establishes that the inheritance was knowledge. Nevertheless, this establishes that inheritance which occurs in the Qur'ān denotes knowledge.

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

Inheritance also refers to a successor

Perhaps some Shīʿī may get technical and say that the reference of inheritance to wealth is its *ḥaqīqī* (actual) implication, whilst its reference to knowledge is its *majāzī* (metaphorical) connotation. And the general rule—which is the basis of his contention—is that the ḥaqīqī meaning cannot be averted for the majāzī one without a very valid reason. It is only acceptable when there are valid reasons.

Our response is that we do not accept that inheritance actually denotes wealth and that knowledge is its majāzī meaning. We assert that inheritance refers to wealth or knowledge, both are the ḥaqīqī meanings of this term. Therefore, inheritance denotes knowledge and wealth equally, and *Wārith* refers to a successor. In fact, if it is said that inheritance actually refers to one who assumes ownership and possession of something, then this meaning is in harmony with the actual connotation of inheritance. We will prove this shortly, Allah willing.

However, since the Fuqahā' utilise this word in the context of possessions that have monetary value, it has been wrongly deduced that inheritance refers to material possessions only. The reality is that inheritance can refer to knowledge, it can refer to assuming a post, and it can refer to possessions having monetary value. The proof that inheritance has come to be confined to a particular connotation despite it not being restricted to that is the instance in the Qur'ān where inheritance cannot refer to knowledge because that which was received was wealth, but there are two differences between this instance and wealth received as inheritance. Firstly, unlike inheritance, this wealth was received from those who they had no familial ties with. Secondly, they received it from those who were following a religion other than Islam. Both these matters are in conflict with the principles of inheritance. Therefore, inheritance in this instance can only refer to succession and being successors, or it can refer to assuming control and possession of something. Consider the following verse:

وَ اَوْرَثْنَا الْقَوْمَ الَّذِيْنَ كَانُوْا يُسْتَضْعَفُوْنَ مَشَارِقَ الْاَرْضِ وَ مَغَارِبَهَا الَّتِىْ بٰرَكْنَا فِيْهَا

And We caused the people who had been oppressed to inherit the eastern regions of the land and the western ones, which We had blessed.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 137.

Therefore, the Banī Isrā'īl 'inherited' from the nation of Firʿawn. And not only were there no familial ties between them, there was a difference in religion too. Assuming that some familial ties did exist, there is no dispute about them being disbelievers, thereby making inheritance unlawful. This establishes that inheritance can only refer to being successors in this instance. It cannot denote knowledge—which they claim is the majāzī connotation nor can it denote inheriting wealth, which they say is its ḥaqīqī meaning. Consider the following verse as another example:

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلّٰهِ يُوْرِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهٖ ۚ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Indeed, the earth belongs to Allah. He causes to inherit it whom He wills of His servants. And the [best] outcome is for the righteous.[1]

In this instance too inheritance means, making them successors.

Inheritance denoting assuming control and possession of something

It is evident from the above that inheritance denotes succession. But if one were to consider carefully, inheritance actually denotes gaining possession and control over something. The following verse establishes this:

تِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ الَّتِيْ نُوْرِثُ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا مَنْ كَانَ تَقِيًّا

That is Paradise, which we give as inheritance to those of Our servants who were fearing of Allah.[2]

In this instance, inheritance can only denote assuming possession and control since Paradise was not previously possessed by anyone, whereby those who abide in it could be referred to as successors. But if one says that it is referred to as the inheritance of Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام—as he dwelt there initially—then the response is that whilst the actual owner is alive, his possessions cannot be inherited.

Therefore, the all-encompassing meaning of inheritance, which applies in every situation, is assuming possession and control over something. Therefore, if we have a general meaning which is applicable in every context then why should we prefer the view that inheritance sometimes denotes its actual meaning and sometimes its metaphorical meaning.

---

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 128.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 63.

In addition to this, the laws of inheritance are age-old laws promulgated in every sharīʿah of every Nabī. Therefore, inheritance in the context of inheriting wealth can be *shari'* (legal) terminology, but the coining of a word for a specific meaning precedes legal terminology. Therefore, the meaning which it was actually intended to convey will always have preference over any legal connotation given to it later on. Nevertheless, we have established that inheritance denoting inheritance of wealth is its legal definition, its actual definition is something else.

Whilst being a legal definition, inheritance in most instances in the Qur'ān cannot denote inheritance of wealth. This establishes that its legal definition is also restricted; it has not become more dominant than the actual definition of the word. Actually, the only places in the Qur'ān where it could possibly denote its legal definition are the verses which the Shīʿah use to establish inheritance from Ambiyā'. However, the reality of that possibility has been exposed. So why divert from the primary meaning of a word to a secondary connotation? Yes, if inheritance, like ṣalāh and ṣawm, was a term initiated by Allah for a specific task, then it would have been a different matter altogether.

Consequently, we have established that knowledge and wealth are metaphoric meanings of inheritance.

Majāz Mutaʿāraf

If we assume—for a moment—that inheritance actually denotes inheritance of wealth and that succession in knowledge is its majāzī meaning then too there is no objection because this [majāz] is now classified as *Majāz Mutaʿāraf*[1], which is on par with the ḥaqīqī meaning. Similarly, the following two verses establish this:

ثُمَّ أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِيْنَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا

Then we caused to inherit the Book those We have chosen of Our servants.[2]

فَخَلَفَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ خَلْفٌ وَّرِثُوْا الْكِتٰبَ

But there followed them successors who inherited the Scripture...[3]

1 A metaphorical meaning which has become the commonly understood connotation of the word.

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 32.

3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

There is no doubt about inheritance referring to succession in knowledge in the above two verses. One can have no reluctance about this matter and this is what is meant by Majāz Mutaʿāraf. Such a majāz is nothing less than the ḥaqīqī meaning and there can be no objection about giving preference to Majāz Mutaʿāraf over the ḥaqīqī meaning. And to go one level beyond this, there is no problem with giving preference to majāz—Mutaʿāraf or not—over ḥaqiqat, when there are reasons supporting it. If this is not permissible, then there would be no need for majāz at all and no use for it.

What supporting reason could be greater for leaving the ḥaqīqī meaning and adopting majāz then the ḥadīth of al-Kulaynī, in addition to other logical and rational reasons?

The narration of Al-Kulaynī

This narration also establishes that inheritance in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and in the case of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام cannot refer to wealth; instead it refers to knowledge. Consequently, the Shīʿah have no response to this narration and it seals the mouths. The narration is as follows:

> روي محمد بن يعقوب الرازي في الكافي عن ابي عبد الله الجعفر بن محمد الصادق عليه السلام انه قال ان العلماء ورثة الانبياء و ذلك ان الانبياء لم يرثوا و لم يورثوا درهما و لا دينارا و انما اورثوا احاديث من احاديثهم فمن اخذ بشيء منها فقد اخذ بحظ وافر
>
> Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّه narrates that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, "Verily the ʿUlamā' are the inheritors of the Ambiyā', that is because the Ambiyā' do not inherit nor do others inherit from them any dirhams or dīnārs; however, they inherit (from the Ambiyā') their aḥādīth. So, whoever holds onto a portion of it, has held onto a large share.

This narration clearly establishes that no one inherits wealth from the Ambiyā'. However, the ʿUlamā' inherit their knowledge. This is precisely the meaning of the ḥadīth which the Ahl al-Sunnah transmit from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If ʿAmmār ʿAlī and other Shīʿī scholars regard it as a fabrication, then this narration should be classified the same. But if this is a Ṣādiq transmission, and then that is a transmission from Ṣiddīq. But liars don't like the truth. If they consider our

narration false, they may even consider Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq false, or they may disassociate themselves from al-Kulaynī. Nevertheless, whether they accept or not, we have the highest regard for the statement of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.

Consequently, on account of *Innamā*—which the Shīʿah also maintain denotes *Ḥaṣr* (confinement), as they contend in the verse:

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللّٰهُ

Verily your walī is Allah...[1]

—the Ambiyā' have left behind nothing besides knowledge. Therefore, the inheritance would denote knowledge in two Qur'ānic verses.

The Shīʿah are now at liberty to call this its ḥaqīqī meaning, or its majazī meaning or Majāz Mutaʿāraf. And if they wish to spite us and say that it is *Majāz Ghayr Mashhūr* and *Ghayr Mutaʿāraf*, we will gladly settle for that too. Since there are so many reasons for it not denoting wealth and there are so many factors demanding that it denotes knowledge this is surely the correct meaning, even if they refer to it as majāz. It has been established that it is a grave error to maintain that it denotes wealth and it is an interpretation which cannot be entertained.

It has thus been proven that in the verse relating to Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, inheritance cannot be wealth; it must denote knowledge.

The same applies to the following verse; inheritance refers to knowledge not wealth:

فَهَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوبَ

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[2]

The second narration from al-Kulaynī also affirms that inheritance refers to knowledge, not wealth. The example of this narration as a response to the Shīʿah is like the proverbial saying of being struck with one's own shoes on one's head.

---

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 55.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

The supplication in Sūrah Maryam—a supplication for a successor (not necessarily a son)

Though the issue has been established but for the sake of delighting the Ahl al-Sunnah and frustrating the Shīʿah the following is worth considering. Consequently, if you look at the verse, *And Indeed, I fear the successors after me*, and the word *Walī* which is mentioned in the supplication, it becomes clear that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ only sought a righteous and upright successor. When he made the supplication recorded in Sūrah Maryam, the desire was not there for a son, though he may have sought this at another juncture. Consequently, the word *Walī* according to linguists does not denote son; it denotes a successor and a deputy. This is also supported by the words *after me*. Consider the translation of these verses:

وَ اِنِّیْ خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِیَ مِنْ وَّ رَآءِیْ وَکَانَتِ امْرَاَتِیْ عَاقِرًا فَهَبْ لِیْ مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ وَلِیًّا یَّرِثُنِیْ وَیَرِثُ مِنْ اٰلِ یَعْقُوْبَ وَ اجْعَلْهُ رَبِّ رَضِیًّا

And Indeed, I fear the successors after me (that they are not worthy of succession after me. If they were to assume authority after me then they would alter the laws of dīn. As for myself, I have no hope of children on account of my old age), and my wife has been barren, so (I appeal to you to) give me from Yourself an heir. Who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb. And make him, my Rabb, pleasing (to You).[1]

It is evident that *Mawāli* in the above instance can only refer to successors and deputies. Therefore, *Walī*, which is a derivative from the same root letters, would also denote successor. And assuming that *Walī* means a son, then *Mawālī* (its plural) would mean sons, whereas Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ had no sons. If he had, why was he seeking another son, as all sons are entitled to inheritance, whether they are good or bad.

As for the possibility that the previous sons were not righteous and this supplication was for a noble and virtuous son, then (being a father) why not pray for their guidance and goodness? The same could be said about *Mawālī*; if they were not virtuous and righteous, he could have made the same supplication for their guidance instead of seeking a son. But there is a difference, one's feeling for one's own children on account of which one's supplication are heartfelt cannot apply

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

equally to other relatives. However, the Shīʿah are also aware that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ had no sons until the moment of his supplication, righteous or misguided. Therefore *Mawālī* "الْمَوَالِيَ" would necessarily refer to those whom he considered his possible successors.

Similarly, it seems apparent that the successor whom he was seeking was one who was not necessarily from his own progeny as he expressed his inability to have a child. Therefore, the 'inheritance' must denote knowledge, not wealth. And if this is not the case then the fact that *Walī* means successor is sufficient to conclude that 'inheritance' refers to knowledge, not wealth.

As for the word *Dhurriyyah*—which refers to children and progeny—appearing in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ at another instance[1], it does not determine that when making the supplication in Sūrah Maryam he was also seeking a son. He may have made different supplications on different occasions. It is possible that when he made the supplication recorded in Sūrah Maryam, he was despondent of having children and he asked for a successor instead. However, Allah was merciful to him and showed him that He had provided unseasonal fruits for Sayyidah Maryam رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and this spurred him on to pray for a child. Therefore, he may have made different supplications in different conditions and the verse under discussion cannot be conclusively a supplication for a son.

Similarly, *Dhurriyyah* does not have to refer to biological children. A compassionate teacher or Shaykh may refer to his students or associates as his children. And a father sometimes disowns a rebellious child and says that he is not his son. In fact, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has dismissed the biological relationship between Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and his son on account of his son's unworthiness. Similarly, Allah has referred to the followers of Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ as his family and he commanded him to board a pair of every kind of animal and his family of the ark. Thus, his family refers to his followers and his relatives only because it is not possible that arrangements were made for animals and not for the Muslims of his era.

---

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 38:

هُنَالِكَ دَعَا زَكَرِيَّا رَبَّهُ قَالَ رَبِّ هَبْ لِي مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ ذُرِّيَّةً طَيِّبَةً إِنَّكَ سَمِيعُ الدُّعَاء

At that, Zakariyyā called upon his Rabb, saying: "My Rabb, grant me from Yourself a good offspring. Indeed, You are the Hearer of supplication."

Based on the above it is very possible that *Dhurriyyah*—in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ—refers to followers. It is also common in Arabic to refer to one's group using the word *Dhurriyyah* or *Āl*.

However, it is only fair to concede that *Dhurriyyah* in Sūrah Āl ʿImrān refers to children, but *Walī* in Sūrah Maryam does not necessarily refer to a son. If it can be proven that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ supplicated once only, then it would be fair to say that he supplicated for a son only. However, since there are two versions of the supplication in two different sūrah's, it is justified to presume that multiple prayers were made. So why it is necessary to maintain that *Walī* refers to a son.

Yes, if considering any other meaning besides a son would render the sentence meaningless then it would have been a valid reason to rule out other possibilities. But in this case, considering it to mean a son has a negative bearing on the meaning since he says:

وَكَانَتِ امْرَاَتِیْ عَاقِرًا

And my wife has been barren.

Nevertheless, *Walī* refers to *Walīʿ Ahd*, i.e. a successor, on account of which inheritance would refer to knowledge not wealth. This clarifies the purpose of using the word *Walī*. Due to the above and the narration of al-Kulaynī, it is clear that inheritance denotes succeeding him in knowledge and in his position. This eradicates any misgivings about the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ conflicting with the two Qur'ānic verses. In fact, the ḥadīth is in harmony with the Qur'ān. Similarly, based on the discussion on *Allah instructs you all* and *And what Allah restored*, even if this ḥadīth is invalid it has no bearing on the Ahl al-Sunnah as elaborated earlier on. Conversely, the Shīʿah will soon realise that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is supported by their own aḥādīth reports.

The Ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr—stronger than Tawātur

Since it has been established that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is not contradicting the Qur'ān there is no need to further verify its authenticity, but for the sake of establishing the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ we will pursue the discussion.

Firstly, to say that this ḥadīth is transmitted by one person only is invalid criticism because this only applies where the narrator has not heard the statement from the primary source directly. As for one who heard a statement from the Prophet ﷺ directly, his transmission is stronger than a thousand reports of those who did not hear it directly. Excessive transmission is deemed necessary to avert the possibility of lies, but when a person hears it directly then there is no need for excessive transmission. Therefore, though thousands may report a matter and it gives one some degree of conviction, it can never give the conviction that is derived from witnessing it personally. Therefore, though there are thousands of reports from people about Makkah, Delhi, London etc., the benefit of seeing it personally and hearing about it cannot be the same. So, when the sight of others cannot be equal to one's vision, the hearing of others cannot be equal to one's own hearing.

Therefore, the Shīʿī objection to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه for practising on something which he heard personally—and no one else heard it besides him—reflects the flaw in their understanding. Every literate and illiterate Muslim knows that it was binding on a Ṣaḥābī to act upon a ḥadīth which he heard personally from the Prophet ﷺ, whether others heard it or not.

Shīʿah and Sunnī scholars of *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* are unanimous that the classification of a ḥadīth as Mutawātir, Mash-hūr, Khabr al-Wahid, etc., has relevance when those who transmit the ḥadīth did not hear the ḥadīth directly or witness the event personally. It has no relevance to those who heard it directly or who were eye witnesses to the events. The direct narration of a Ṣaḥābī from the Prophet ﷺ is far weightier than a Mutawātir transmission. Thus, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr practised upon what he heard. Therefore, this objection has no basis, unless of course one has no faith in Abū Bakr as-Ṣiddīq, which is a different issue altogether.

Multiple transmissions of this Ḥadīth

However, if we have to speak to people on their level of understanding, then so be it. If multiple transmissions of a ḥadīth makes it authentic, and not hearing it personally, then take note of the following; just as there are instances when a ḥadīth would be considered invalid—when the narrators are liars and when the content blatantly conflicts *naql* (narration) or *ʿaql* (logic), similarly there are two instances which render a ḥadīth valid, namely the integrity of the narrators are

beyond any doubt and it is supported by the Qur'ān, authentic aḥādīth, i.e. naql and/or ʿaql.

In the same manner, if a ḥadīth is transmitted by very few individuals and that ḥadīth conflicts minimally or substantially with more authentic aḥādīth, then the reliability of that narration would be compromised relevantly. Similarly, if a ḥadīth has profuse transmission and it is in harmony with authentic aḥādīth then its reliability would be enhanced proportionately.

We have, thus, outlined the two instances when a ḥadīth would be considered valid as well as the two factors affecting the reliability of a ḥadīth.

Considering multiple transmissions, this ḥadīth is not reported by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone. There are more than ten other narrators of such integrity like has never been. Therefore, the criticism of the Shīʿah—which ʿAmmār ʿAlī ignorantly records—about Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ denying Fadak on account of hearing a ḥadīth is false and baseless. Consequently, the ḥadīth is recorded in Sunnī references on the authority of Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām, Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān, Abū al-Dardā', Abū Hurayrah, ʿAbbās, ʿAlī, ʿUthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqās, Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah, ʿUmar al-Fārūq and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Now if the Shīʿah do not accept the transmission of ʿĀ'ishah, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, then what about the rest. Have they committed any crime besides speaking the truth in a matter which is highly sensitive to the Shīʿah? But we plead with them not to ruin themselves just out of spite for the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consequently, are they not aware of the fact that rejecting the words of an infallible Imām renders a Shīʿī a non-Muslim. Therefore, in order to remain Shīʿah they must accept the ḥadīth as it is transmitted by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ too.

Similarly, rejecting the transmission of Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has negative consequences as well. Although he is not an infallible Imām, but in this case his transmission is no less than that of an infallible Imām. This is because Mullah ʿAbd Allāh Shahīd records the ḥadīth of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in *Iẓhār al-Ḥaqq*, which is as follows:

ما حدثكم به حذيفة فصدقوه

Attest to whatever Ḥudhayfah narrates to you.

Evidence from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī

Just in case someone doubts that this ḥadīth is actually transmitted from Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, I record the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, which is the most authentic book after the Qur'ān. It is as follows, narrated by Mālik ibn Aws:

حدثنا إسحاق بن محمد الفروي، حدثنا مالك بن أنس، عن ابن شهاب، عن مالك بن أوس بن الحدثان، وكان، محمد بن جبير ذكر لي ذكرا من حديثه ذلك، فانطلقت حتى أدخل على مالك بن أوس، فسألته عن ذلك الحديث فقال مالك بينا أنا جالس في أهلي حين متع النهار، إذا رسول عمر بن الخطاب يأتيني فقال أجب أمير المؤمنين. فانطلقت معه حتى أدخل على عمر، فإذا هو جالس على رمال سرير، ليس بينه وبينه فراش متكئ على وسادة من أدم، فسلمت عليه ثم جلست فقال يا مالك ، إنه قدم علينا من قومك أهل أبيات، وقد أمرت فيهم برضخ فاقبضه فاقسمه بينهم. فقلت يا أمير المؤمنين، لو أمرت به غيري. قال اقبضه أيها المرء. فبينا أنا جالس عنده أتاه حاجبه يرفا فقال هل لك في عثمان وعبد الرحمن بن عوف والزبير وسعد بن أبي وقاص يستأذنون قال نعم. فأذن لهم فدخلوا فسلموا وجلسوا، ثم جلس يرفا يسيرا ثم قال هل لك في علي وعباس قال نعم. فأذن لهما، فدخلا فسلما فجلسا، فقال عباس يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بيني وبين هذا. وهما يختصمان فيما أفاء الله على رسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم من بني النضير. فقال الرهط عثمان وأصحابه يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بينهما وأرح أحدهما من الآخر. قال عمر تيدكم، أنشدكم بالله الذي بإذنه تقوم السماء والأرض، هل تعلمون أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال "لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة". يريد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نفسه. قال الرهط قد قال ذلك. فأقبل عمر على علي وعباس فقال أنشدكما الله، أتعلمان أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد قال ذلك قالا قد قال ذلك.

While I was at home, the sun rose high and it got hot. Suddenly the messenger of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb came to me and said, "The chief of the believers has sent for you."

So, I went along with him till I entered the place where ʿUmar was sitting on a bedstead made of date-palm leaves and covered with no mattress, and he was leaning over a leather pillow. I greeted him and sat down.

He said, "O Malik, some persons of your people who have families came to me and I have ordered that a gift should be given to them, so take it and distribute it among them."

I said, "O chief of the believers, I wish that you order someone else to do it."

He said, "O man! Take it."

While I was sitting there with him, his doorman Yarfa' came saying, "'Uthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, al-Zubayr and Saʿd ibn Abi Waqqās are asking your permission to see you; may I admit them?"

ʿUmar said, "Yes."

So, they were admitted and they came in, greeted him, and sat down. After a while Yarfa' came again and said, "May I admit ʿAlī and ʿAbbās?"

ʿUmar said, "Yes."

So, they were admitted and they came in and greeted him and sat down.

Then ʿAbbās said, "O chief of the believers! Judge between me and him (i.e. ʿAlī)."

They had a dispute regarding the property of Banū al-Naḍīr which Allah had given to His Prophet as Fay'.

The group, i.e. ʿUthmān and his companions said, "O chief of the believers, judge between them and relieve both of them of each other."

ʿUmar said, "Be patient! I beseech you by Allah by Whose Permission the Heaven and the Earth exist, do you know that Allah's Messenger ﷺ said, 'Our (i.e. Prophets') property will not be inherited, and whatever we leave, is Ṣadaqah, and Allah's Messenger ﷺ meant himself (by saying 'we')?"

The group said, "He said so."

ʿUmar then turned to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās and said, "I beseech you by Allah, do you know that Allah's Messenger ﷺ said so?"

They replied, "He said so."[1]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 3094.

It is evident from this narration that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ transmits this ḥadīth. Therefore, if they were reluctant to accept this ḥadīth because of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ transmitting it alone, then there is the testimony of so many Ṣaḥābah. And if they claim that it is in conflict with the Qur'ān, then that is their short-sightedness and the reality is somewhat different, as elaborated on earlier. Similarly, if they object because he heard it directly from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then that issue has also been dealt with; one's seeing or hearing is conclusive.

This ḥadīth is transmitted by so many Ṣaḥābah that it is rare to find aḥādīth like this. Similarly, most of them are from the ʿAsharah Mubasharah. In fact, its transmission by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is equivalent to the transmission of hundreds of thousands of narrators—especially according to the Shīʿah. Therefore, there can be no doubt about the validity of this ḥadīth.

Therefore, the Shīʿah should consider this ḥadīth no less in weight than a Qur'ānic verse. Then how was it possible for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to dismiss this ḥadīth and not act upon it? As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, its transmission by such esteemed Ṣaḥābah makes it as conclusive as the Qur'ān. Every individual Ṣaḥābī among them is so esteemed that his transmission is weightier than Mutawātir, so what can be said about them collectively.

As for its conformance with the Qur'ān, it is evident. The Shīʿah were demonstrating on account of *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), but is has been proven that the Ḥadīth is in harmony with the verse.

No contradiction between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth

If any one feels that there is contradiction between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān, then it is feared that such fools may go on to criticise the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in another matter. They may consider the aḥādīth which forbid zakāh and Ṣadaqah upon the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in conflict with the following verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَالْعَامِلِيْنَ عَلَيْهَا وَالْمُؤَلَّفَةِ قُلُوْبُهُمْ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ وَالْغَارِمِيْنَ وَفِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ فَرِيْضَةً مِنَ اللّٰهِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [zakāh] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam] and for freeing captives [or

slaves] and for those in debt and for the cause of Allah and for the [stranded] traveller - an obligation [imposed] by Allah.[1]

Therefore, they may accuse the Prophet ﷺ of opposing this verse. Consequently, the Prophet's ﷺ 'poverty' is well-known and his prayer to remain in humble conditions till the end of his life and be raised with those people is also well-known. Therefore, if he was the Leader of the people of less-means in this world then he was most deserving of ṣadaqah and zakāh.

Similarly, there is no exclusion or takhṣīṣ in the verse above, whereby he is to be considered exempted. Unlike *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), where the tone of address is to the Ummah and there is evidence of the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from that.

However, when both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah are unanimous that the aḥādīth prohibiting charity for the Prophet ﷺ are not in conflict with the verse, *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor*, then the ḥadīth—what we leave behind is ṣadaqah—is in greater harmony with the Qur'ānic verse. This is because the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from the law of inheritance is understood from the context of the sūrah and the tone of *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) itself, whereas the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ from charity is not understood from *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor*.

If anything does establish his exclusion than it can possibly be the verse:

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَلْمِزُكَ فِي الصَّدَقَاتِ فَإِنْ أُعْطُوْا مِنْهَا رَضُوْا وَإِنْ لَمْ يُعْطَوْا مِنْهَا إِذَا هُمْ يَسْخَطُوْنَ

And among them are some who criticise you concerning the (distribution of) charities. If they are given from them, they approve; but if they are not given from them, at once they become angry.[2]

which does not even appear directly before or after this. However, it is possible to extract the exclusion from it. The meaning is as follows; this verse establishes that the Prophet ﷺ was authorised to distribute charity. The verse *Zakāh*

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 58.

expenditures are only for the poor establishes that charity is for the poor and the destitute and that the hypocrites do not have rights over it. Therefore, since the Prophet ﷺ was appointed to distribute it and the needy and destitute were declared the recipients and the hypocrites were to be dismissed, it implies that the Prophet ﷺ was excluded from receiving anything from it. This is just how a person entrusts a person who is needy himself with the task of distributing something to poor people and to omit the wealthy. It is commonly understood that the person entrusted with the task is not supposed to receive anything. (This is the practical illustration of the above verses.) Consequently, this is the reason why *for the Rasūl* has been mentioned explicitly in the verse of Khums and Fay'—to establish that along with the duty of distribution, the Prophet ﷺ is entitled to his independent share.

Nevertheless, the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor* is by an external factor and a verse disconnected from it. As for his exclusion from *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), his exclusion is established from the verse itself and internal factors. Therefore, if the aḥādīth prohibiting zakāh are established and they are not in conflict with *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor* then "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is also established and in greater harmony with *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all).

Similarly, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is also not in conflict with *an heir, who will inherit me and And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd*, because the verses refer to inheriting the legacy of knowledge whilst the ḥadīth refutes inheritance of wealth. This discussion has been recorded in detail already.

As for the narration, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," conforming to other authentic aḥādīth it must be said that this ḥadīth enjoys such prestige that the Ahl al-Sunnah do not regard it necessary for it to conform to other narrations. It is a criterion by itself. Despite this, it has multiple transmissions and all its chains are authentic and this is what is meant by conforming to authentic narrations.

As for the authenticity of a ḥadīth, it is determined by the soundness of the chain of transmission. Similarly, multiple chains of transmission constitute multiple aḥādīth (even though the content is the same). Therefore, if one text is transmitted via multiple chains then each chain would be considered an independent ḥadīth. Now that multiple transmissions has given us multiple aḥādīth—with slight variation

in wording in some—and each one is in harmony with the other then it would be said that "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is in harmony with authentic aḥādīth.

Shīʿī reports in substantiation

However, if the above evidence leaves anyone in doubt then it is surely the Shīʿah. They need greater evidence; evidence from their texts that this ḥadīth is in harmony with authentic narrations. Therefore, Shīʿī scholars and laity are aware that no book has greater standing than the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī. Have we not alluded to the ḥadīth recorded therein transmitted on the authority of Abū al-Bakhtarī from Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq which states the following:

> ان العلماء ورثة الانبياء و ذلك ان الانبياء لم يرثوا و لم يورثوا درهما و لا دينارا و انما اورثوا احاديث من احاديثهم فمن اخذ بشيء منها فقد اخذ بحظ وافر
>
> Verily the ʿUlamā' are the inheritors of the Ambiyā', that is because the Ambiyā' do not inherit nor do others inherit from them any dirhams or dīnārs; however, they inherit (from the Ambiyā') their aḥādīth. So, whoever holds onto a portion of it, has held onto a large share.

Consequently, this narration establishes exactly what is established from the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, on account of the devious nature of the Shīʿah, Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ says that the legacy of Ambiyā' is knowledge. Therefore, if the version, "we are not inherited from," is considered then it implies that none inherits from them except the ʿUlamā', who inherit their knowledge. This is because the Ambiyā' also have not inherited fortunes from anyone. If the version, "the Ambiyā' do not inherit," is considered it implies that the ʿUlamā' inherit their knowledge because they have not left behind wealth as inheritance. As for Fadak, it was not the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ personal possession as has been elaborated on previously.

Personal effects

As for other personal effects such as clothing, home and conveyance; the following should be noted: the homes of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which were simple rooms, were already in the possession of the noble wives according to the declaration of the Qur'ān. Consequently, Allah said:

وَقَرْنَ فِيْ بُيُوْتِكُنَّ

And abide in your houses.[1]

and He did not say, "in the homes of the Nabī". It is thus established that these rooms belonged to them and that the Prophet ﷺ gave it to them.

However, someone could say that when speaking about the home one lives in, one refers to it as one's own home despite it being rented or actually belonging to someone else. Therefore, it is not necessarily the case that those rooms belonged to them.

Well, we do not have a problem with that because even if it belonged to the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life it becomes charity immediately thereafter and the noble wives assumed authority over it just like how Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها received revenue from Fadak.

Nevertheless, we are not concerned with the technicalities revolving around the word, "your houses," we are only concerned about keeping the contents of the ḥadīth of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq in mind. So, if the Shīʿah have a problem with the meaning which we understand from the verse, then so be it. Either way, the homes were not the Prophet's ﷺ property or inheritance upon his departure from this world.

Yes, from his personal effects they may ask about his clothing and conveyance. However, one's īmān demands that since Imām Jaʿfar uses the word *Innamā* which denotes *ḥaṣr*—his legacy was nothing else but knowledge. Therefore, there should be no reservations at all. Whilst the Prophet ﷺ may have left clothing behind, it is possible that he gifted it to someone in his lifetime and used it as a loan as long as he required it.

Even if this does not make sense to you, do not refute the words of the infallible Imām. Consider it a deficiency of your understanding instead. But for the sake of clarification for the Muslims it must be noted that "the Ambiyā' do not inherit" does not mean that they did not leave any material possessions behind; it means that they did not leave anything inheritable. This makes it clear why the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is correct.

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

Since Imām Jaʿfar was aware of the contents of this hadith, he added the word *Innamā* to reinforce this meaning.

Therefore, if we analyse both narrations then the narration of Imām Jaʿfar conveys the exact meaning of the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ since he says that the Ambiyā' do not leave any material possessions for inheritance. Actually, his narration expresses that they have only left behind knowledge and this fact is not contained in the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, the ḥadīth of Imām Jaʿfar expresses two matters whilst the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ expresses one only. Imām Jaʿfar's رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ narration has substantiation as well so that his claim bears more weight. Whilst he was at ease about the Ahl al-Sunnah, he was apprehensive of the Shīʿah misunderstanding or distorting his words, so he clarified it thoroughly.

But it is no wonder that the Shīʿah have forfeited their īmān by rejecting the words of their Imām. They are even capable of disowning their own Imāms. Only Allah can make them understand as no Shaykh, Imām, Ṣaḥābī or Nabī can achieve this. They should be ashamed of themselves; criticising the Ṣaḥābah on behalf of those who were in harmony and accord with the Ṣaḥābah. They have lost the celestial light of īmān by vilifying the Ṣaḥābah and they have lost īmān itself by rejecting their Imāms. This is because they maintain that one who rejects the words of an infallible Imām is a kāfir, and if this is transmitted in the most authentic book of *al-Kāfī*, then what can be said. Nevertheless, the ḥadīth "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is correct and in harmony with Shīʿī ḥadīth reports.

The second Ḥadīth of al-Kulaynī

The above Shīʿī narration is supported by a second ḥadīth, which also appears in *al-Kāfī*. The ḥadīth, which has passed earlier on along with its translation is as follows:

ان سليمان ورث داود و ان محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ورث سليمان

> Verily Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd, and Muḥammad inherited from Sulaymān.

It is evident from this that the inheritance of the Ambiyā' is nothing else but knowledge. The discussions relating to this ḥadīth have been submitted earlier on but we will make a brief reference to two logical evidences recorded earlier.

Firstly, the Ambiyā' are alive in their graves and the possessions of a living person cannot be inherited by anyone. However, if the nature of those possessions is such that they cannot benefit from personally then their directives regarding it must be adhered to by their successors. Therefore, since the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave—and this has been established—his material possessions are not inheritable. It was therefore the responsibility of his successor, who in this case happens to be Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, to carry out his orders regarding it and these are contained in the statement, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah". If some sceptic denies the life of the Ambiyā' in their graves, then there is a second logical evidence which is as follows: inheritance cannot apply to the material possessions of the Ambiyā' due to their strong conviction that everything belongs solely Allah and it was entrusted to them to use for a specific time like an item that has been borrowed. Therefore, when their time lapsed and they returned to Allah, their possession of it was relinquished instantaneously. Nevertheless, these two logical arguments have been discussed at length.

The share of other shareholders

Whilst it is contested whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withheld Fadak rightfully or oppressively it must be noted that he gave no share of it to Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها. Similarly, Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه did not give any share of it to Sayyidah Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها. The laws of inheritance demand that both of them should have received a share as they were the wives of the Prophet ﷺ. This establishes that not giving them was in conformance with the instruction of the Prophet ﷺ; it was not withheld oppressively from anyone. If they really did oppress Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها then they surely would not have oppressed their own daughters.

Similarly, those who snatch the wealth and possessions of others are not characterised by abstention from this world and worldly things. Therefore, it makes no sense that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه usurped Fadak but he did not benefit in any way from it nor did he allow his relatives to benefit from it. This also establishes that withholding it was in accordance with the injunction of the Prophet ﷺ. Perhaps the Shīʿah accuse him of fraud due to saying that a man judges' others by his own standards.

The Ahl al-Bayt and the possessions of the Prophet ﷺ

Whilst they do criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, they do not level any criticism against the Ahl al-Bayt on the same matter. Let us take a moment to analyse their activities in this regard.

Consequently, each one of them from Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه till the last of them assumed administration of it without giving the wives of the Prophet ﷺ or the family of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه any share from it. If the Prophet's ﷺ possessions were inheritable then his wives and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه were entitled to half of it. Why then did these infallible Imāms tread on the path of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq? If Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه committed an error then it was possible for him to do so, but what calamity befell the infallible Imāms, leading them to such oppression?

Consequently, historians and ḥadīth scholars are unanimous that Fadak was under the control of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما during the era of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه then assumed control to the exclusion of Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه. It then went to Sayyidunā Ḥasan and then to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما. Next came Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رحمه الله and Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan رحمه الله. Thereafter it went to Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Ḥasan—the son of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه—thereafter it went to the sons of Marwan and remained in their possession until ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz arrived. He released all rights and restored it to its original condition.

Thus, the practice of the illustrious Imāms proves that the material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ are not subjected to inheritance. Instead, it was Waqf. This explains why the infallible Imāms withheld it from the inheritors and this establishes that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه (what we leave behind is ṣadaqah) is legitimate and sound.

Similarly, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withholding it from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is just like the infallible Imāms withholding it from the wives of the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه seems purer than the integrity of the infallible Imāms in the light of a criticism which can be levelled against them from the Khawārij. The Khawārij could say that they withheld it as they had their vested interests on account of being direct legitimate heirs. As for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, he had no vested interests as he was not entitled to any part of it. But despite the purity of his integrity, the Shīʿah have not failed to say that he changed

colours immediately upon the demise of the Prophet ﷺ and denied Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها what was lawfully hers.

Nevertheless, whilst Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withheld Fadak and the infallible Imāms also withheld it, there is a greater degree of dedication from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. In fact, his steadfastness upon the truth must be lauded for despite his devotion to the Ahl al-Bayt and despite seeing the displeasure of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها—which is sufficient to make anyone compromise—he conformed with the directive of the Prophet ﷺ. The Shīʿah, however, are blinded by their enmity and disbelief.

Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه complied with the prophetic injunction and there is no doubt that the ḥadīth which he practised upon is valid. Consequently, the detailed analysis of its authenticity has passed and there is no room for doubt. This establishes that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's comments about this ḥadīth are baseless. He says the following:

> **In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed of in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.**

It has been established that what he claims to be in conflict with the Qur'an is actually in perfect harmony with it. As for claiming that it was transmitted to one Ṣaḥābī only, it has been established that more than ten Ṣaḥābah transmit it, including Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, and Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها. Allah alone knows how many others heard this prophetic statement but did not have the opportunity to relate it. But if Molvī Ammar is unaware of these facts then what are we supposed to do about that. He either seems to be in a state of ignorance or intentional failure to acknowledge the reality.

As for saying that none of the inheritors were informed about this, if this statement is made in ignorance than he must be alerted to the reality. If someone is unaware of something it does not necessarily imply that the particular matter had not occurred. Nevertheless, his allegation would have been correct if Sayyidunā ʿAbbās and Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنهما were not inheritors. As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī, whilst he was

not a direct inheritor but the most important person in this matter on account of his representation of Sayyidah Fāṭimah and on account of him possibly inheriting from her—transmitting the ḥadīth to him is more appropriate than transmitting it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. In addition to this, speaking about matters related to death to one's closest relatives causes anguish and more so in the case of a daughter whose feelings for her father are most intense. Therefore, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had to openly tell Sayyidah Fāṭimah that she was entitled to nothing of his worldly possessions after his demise—as ʿAmmār ʿAlī suggests—when the thought of his demise would already cause immense grief than would it be prudent or not to divulge this unfavourable news to her as well?

The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was fully aware of the fact that if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا took the initiative of addressing this matter with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ—whom he knew with certainty would be his successor—without the knowledge of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, then Abū Bakr would never be so weak as to compromise the truth. Similarly, he also knew that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would also not be so persistent about inheritance and ignore the truth which was related to her by Ṣiddīq al-Akbar.

Since it is humanly possible to err just as Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ erred when he took Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to task, and if on account of this possibility Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا disputed the issue after hearing the ḥadīth, then Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was always there to reassure her that the matter is at it stands.

Therefore, the claim that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not inform any of his inheritors is fraudulent and deceptive.

Fāṭimah and ʿIlm al-Ghayb

Actually, the allegation of concealing the ḥadīth from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا makes no sense at all. This is because there is no way something could have remained hidden from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا; she is after all no less than the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt in any way. If the Imāms have all-encompassing knowledge of past and present matters than Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا shares this characteristic. Therefore, it would be actually better to say that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ felt that there was no need to tell her because only those need to be told who are unaware.

However, if the commandments of the sharīʿah are considered an exception from the all-encompassing knowledge of the Imāms, or if Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is

considered inferior to them in this respect then too the allegation of concealment is invalid, because if a few people from one group are informed of something it is just as good as everyone knowing about it. Therefore, when the merits of propagating knowledge are so profuse then how could it be possible for this command of sharīʿah to remain obscure. After all, the Prophet ﷺ was not responsible for passing every message individually to every Muslim; he related information to some and the word gradually got around to the rest. Yes, if he had not charged those whom he had related the ḥadīth to with the responsibility of propagating it to everyone then it could be said that law of the sharīʿah was kept hidden.

Since it was most appropriate to convey this information to Ṣiddīq al-Akbar, the Prophet ﷺ did just that. Similarly, it is evident that giving and receiving are two actions carried out by two individuals. If one party does not act, giving and taking cannot materialise. Therefore, by alerting one of the two parties, the act of giving and receiving would not occur. This is why it was sufficient to relate this information to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, as he would be responsible for giving in this instance.

It could be said that based on this philosophy of giving and receiving it would have been better to relate the ḥadīth to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, who is the possible recipient in this case. In fact, relating it to her would have averted the unpleasant disagreement altogether.

We do agree that it was possible to relate the information to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها instead, but there are certain benefits in the first case which cannot be found in the second situation.

These are as follows:

Firstly, making a bequest of this nature to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه indicates to the legitimacy of his khilāfah. It automatically hints that he is selected as the khalīfah, even if this is not expressed in clear terms. This hint is not the first of its kind. Actually, there are much more glaring indications contained in the Sunnah and some are even contained in the Glorious Qur'ān. This deals adequately with the nonsensical remark of ʿAmmār ʿAlī of "reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report". Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ knew that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would be at the helm of affairs and he made the relevant bequests to him so that the khilāfah could run on the course of Nubuwwah.

Similarly, there could be a disadvantage in only divulging information to the recipient, if the recipient becomes a victim of the impulses of the nafs, and withholds such information. Whilst this cannot be fathomed about Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on account of her being mahfūz or maʿsūm, it is also a fact that distinct and special circumstances do not dictate the application of sharʿī law. Therefore, if a matter in a court of law receives the testimony of only one person then despite that person being a saint of undisputed integrity, his testimony would have no implication on the case. In contrast to this, if two credible persons having less integrity than the first testify against his testimony, it would receive acceptance. This is because the benefit of general application of the law supersedes the rare instance of overlooking it in a specific instance. So, whilst the Shīʿah do claim that it was better to notify Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا about the situation, the general rule in this case is that the giver should be prohibited from giving, not the recipient prohibited from receiving.

In the first place it is actually incorrect to say that notifying her would have averted the unpleasant disagreement that followed since there was no disagreement and conflict at all. This will be highlighted soon, Allah willing. It is nothing more than the mischief of the Shīʿah, which they have publicised at length and it has no reality to it.

Secondly, when unpleasant incidents of this nature occur among the Ambiyā' of Allah they are not really referred to as arguments. Sometimes such situations are unavoidable and the incident of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is known to one and all.

Similarly, an unpleasant event resolved soon after its occurrence is hardly ever taken note of and even if there is premonition of its possibility, one does not go to lengths to avert it. Surely Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq would have the dignity of apologising and refusing with politeness and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would not be a victim of misguidance and deviation. Therefore, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not bother about these trivial matters and the narration of *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn* proves that events turned out just as he would have expected. This narration—which will be recorded in due course—establishes that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did excuse himself and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was satisfied by his clarification. This resolved the matter and restored the relationship between them harmoniously.

Thirdly, to say that that if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had told Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا there would have been no disagreement is assuming that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had knowledge of

the unseen. Many verses in the Qur'ān refute the notion that the Prophet ﷺ or for that matter anyone else has knowledge of the unseen. Consider the following verses:

قُل لَّا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِيْ نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللّٰهُ وَلَوْ كُنتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَاسْتَكْثَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ وَمَا مَسَّنِيَ السُّوءُ إِنْ أَنَا إِلَّا نَذِيْرٌ وَبَشِيْرٌ لِّقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ

Say, "I hold not for myself [the power of] benefit or harm, except what Allah has willed. And if I knew the unseen, I could have acquired much wealth, and no harm would have touched me. I am not except a warner and a bringer of good tidings to a people who believe."[1]

And:

قُل لَّا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِيْ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَمَا يَشْعُرُوْنَ أَيَّانَ يُبْعَثُوْنَ

Say, "None in the heavens and earth knows the unseen except Allah, and they do not perceive when they will be resurrected."[2]

The first verse discounts the notion that the Prophet ﷺ had knowledge of the unseen whilst the second verse refutes the idea that anyone—angels, Prophets, Jinn, or humans—has knowledge of the unseen.

These issues are logical and can be understood quite clearly. If one then fails to understand due to lack of intellect, what can one do?

Fourthly, since the benefit in telling both would be accomplished by telling either one, it was appropriate for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be told as he would be the one tasked to discharge the affairs whilst Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was only a possible recipient. Further, by telling Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه who was primarily charged with discharging all the affairs, the issue under review was resolved from its roots. On the other hand, the issue in relation to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was a mere branch and thus telling her would not be as effective when surveying the larger picture.

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 188.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 65.

In any case, the fact that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was to be the khalīfah outlines the importance of telling him. Judgment in cases would be brought to him and in the case of inheritance from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he would pass judgment accordingly no matter who presented the case to him from the heirs: Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, or anyone else. By doing so a clear message would have been sent to the other heirs as well and, thus, they would not conduct any impermissible transaction within the inheritance. Aside from this, there was no element of impermissibility or sin in seeking the inheritance by the heirs whilst unaware that they had no right to it.

Furthermore, telling ʿAbbās and ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا would have sufficed too since together they would have received just less than half of the inherence had it been distributed. Thus, if Fāṭimah or Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were left unaware as well it would not have mattered. When the time came, the reality of the matter would have come to light. Leave all of this, let us assume that neither Abū Bakr, ʿĀ'ishah, or ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, had any inkling of the matter and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the only one told (and as we have established he had knowledge of the matter) then too it was just as telling Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا because she was under his care and both their sons were yet children.

The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was fully aware that the issue of his inheritance would not be under consideration by only one or two people that it could be wrapped up in a clandestine manner. It was an impossibility that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would go seeking her inheritance and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be unaware. For arguments sake, if we assume that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was allotted a share of the inheritance, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be the one to go and take possession of it. Besides, ʿĀ'ishah and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا weren't strangers to her. The former was akin to her mother and the latter like a grandfather. With such close familial ties, the issue of inheritance would have been openly discussed between them. In making ʿĀ'ishah and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا aware, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and the other Noble Consorts of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would also become aware of the reality of the matter. If not at the time of his passing, then definitely at the time of seeking. Such matters are not kept a secret that no one would know.

In conclusion, the manner in which the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ conducted this matter was in no way shrouded in secrecy. He had clarified it in front of ten/twelve and who knows how many more people. A point of note here is that amongst those that he made aware were ʿĀ'ishah, ʿAbbās, and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; two direct heirs and the other

an heir of an heir. Therefore, to claim that the divine law of prophetic inheritance was kept a secret from the heirs by the Prophet ﷺ is nonsensical.

An example of the Shīʿah keeping a divine law a secret

Shrouding a divine law with secrecy is what can be found amongst the false and fabricated narrations of the Shīʿah wherein they suppose Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn kept the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir a secret from his son Zayd al-Shahīd. Secrecy that—according to Shīʿī dogma—results in disbelief. Consider the following narration which forms the basis of their belief:

من لم يعرف امام زمانه فقد مات ميتة جاهلية

Whoever does not know the Imām of his time has died a death of ignorance.

Thus, according to the Shīʿah, whoever does not know the Imām of his time—from the Twelve Imāms—dies a death just like those before the Prophethood of the Prophet ﷺ, a death of ignorance doomed to the fire. To put this into perspective, they propose that Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn kept such a secret from Zayd al-Shahīd which is a fundamental belief of faith. This is keeping a secret of divine law! Not going to every heir and telling each one of them "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is sadaqah", is quite to the contrary!

Hereunder is the complete narration that outlines the above incident:

روى الكليني عن أبان قال: أخبرني الأحول أن زيد بن علي بعث إليه وهو مختف، قال: فأتيته فقال: يا أبا جعفر ما تقول إن طرقك طارق منا أتخرج معه. قال: فقلت له: إن كان أباك أو أخاك خرجت معه، فقال لي: فأنا أريد أن أخرج أجاهد هؤلاء القوم فاخرج معي، قال: قلت لا أفعل جعلت فداك، فقال: أترغب بنفسك عن نفسي؟ قال: قلت له: إنما هي نفس واحدة فإن كان لله في الأرض حجة فالمتخلف عنك والخارج معك سواء، قال: فقال: يا أبا جعفر كنت أجلس مع أبي في الخوان فيلقمني البضعة السمينة ويبرد لي اللقمة حتى تبرد شفقة علي ولم يشفق علي حر النار، إذ أخبرك ولم يخبرني به؟ فقلت له: خاف عليك أن لا تقبله فتدخل النار، وأخبرني أنا فإن قبلت نجوت وإن لم يبال أن أدخل النار،

Al-Kulaynī narrated from Abān who said:

Al-Aḥwal reported to me saying, "Zayd ibn ʿAlī sent for me while he was in hiding so I went to see him."

He [Zayd] said to me, "O Abū Jaʿfar [al-Aḥwal] what will you say if a knocker from among us knocks on your door [asking for your support], would you come assist him?"

I said to him, "If it is your father or your brother [al-Bāqir] I would set out with him."

He [Zayd] said to me, "Verily I wish to rise up and fight these people so set out with me."

I said, "No, I will not do so may I be made your ransom."

He said to me, "Do you prefer your life over mine?"

I said, "It is only one soul [that I have], if Allah does indeed have a *Ḥujjah* [proof; Imām] on the earth then the one who stays back and the one who joins you are both the same. [There is no benefit in joining you in jihād,]"

He said to me, "O Abū Jaʿfar I used to sit with my father to share a plate with him so he would feed me the choicest piece of meat and cool for me a hot morsel out of love for me but he did not love me enough to save me from the hell-fire! How could it be that he informed you [of the Imāmah of Imām Bāqir] and did not inform me?"

I said to him, "He feared for you that you would reject it and enter the fire, but he informed me [not caring either way], so if I accept, I am saved and he was not bothered that I enter the fire [if I reject]."

There are many aspects in this narration that lend support to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah; however, this is not the place for it nor do we have the time to expand on it. Our focus in this narration is Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn hiding the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir from his son Zayd al-Shahīd, whilst aware that knowing of his Imāmah was pillar of faith.

Consider the Fadak Estate; materialistic wealth, in relation to knowing the Imām of the time; a pillar of faith. Then consider Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn keeping this from his son in relation to the Prophet ﷺ informing more than ten people regarding

the Fadak Estate with the intent of them passing it on. Further, understand the devastating and everlasting impact of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn not informing his son Zayd al-Shahīd of the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and mirror it to the Prophet ﷺ not informing Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or any other heir of the narration, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah'. Even if—as assumed by the Shīʿah—the Prophet ﷺ only informed Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه of it, does it lead to devastating or lasting impact as with the case Zayd al-Shahīd?

Taking provision from the adage *recounting disbelief does not result in disbelief*, the result in the case of Zayd al-Shahīd not being aware of the Imām of his time would be him becoming a disbeliever and be subject to everlasting punishment.

For arguments sake, if we assume that the Prophet ﷺ did not inform anyone, neither Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه nor any other heir of the status of his inheritance and as a result the heirs distributed his estate—which was waqf—amongst themselves, then too there would be no blame on them in this world or the next. In any case, weigh the above two cases and compare the **secrecy** within them as well as the **resulting harm** and see which end of the scale falls.

After reading the above discussion, anyone having even a modicum of intelligence will conclude, that in no way can the Prophet ﷺ be accused of hiding a divine injunction whilst on the other hand—according to the Shīʿah—Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn without a doubt kept a divine injunction a secret. Oh, how razor sharp is the intellect of Molvī ʿAmmār that he considers the former a gross injustice and secrecy of divine law whilst he glosses over the latter! I wonder who ever told him to insert his opinion in the matters of faith. Such nonsensical spewing of the ignorant aren't even worthy of answering; however, keeping quiet in front of such atrociousness burns one from inside and thus I have written much and am bound to continue to do so.

Did Abū Bakr return the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah

Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī states:

> **Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها went to Abū Bakr more than once to seek her inheritance upon which he wrote out a document restoring the Fadak Estate to her. ʿUmar then appeared, snatched the document, and tore it to pieces.**

These statements will be analysed and the truth of the matter clearly explained. In reality his assertion is a lie told to cover other lies. For his allegations he references Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, al-Wāqidī, and Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī al-Shafiʿī and others. This is all a farce in order to beguile the Ahl al-Sunnah. The issue of Shīʿah narrations within the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah has already been discussed. There is no need to delve into it again, whoever wishes may refer to the section. However, then too, the references he has listed will be dealt with shortly.

The question of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا going back to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, advising him, his writing of a document restoring it to her, and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tearing it is a fabrication of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Even the staunch Shīʿah have not gone to level he has gone to in his fabrications. Consider the following narration cited by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, a Shīʿī scholar of note who no doubt had far more hatred for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Yet he too did not stupidly reproduce this incident of her going back to him and further ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tearing it. Rather he says:

لما وعظت فاطمة ابا بكر في فدك كتب لها كتابا وردها عليها

> When Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا advised Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding the Fadak Estate, he wrote out a document restoring it to her.[1]

This much too, as asserted by al-Ḥillī, is an attack on the integrity of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ insinuating he intended to withhold the Fadak Estate, returning it only after being offered counsel by Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. It also attacks Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ real viewpoint on the issue since if the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was true, he would not have moved to restore it to her based on her counsel. It would be he, who would counsel Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

Also, if the incident of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tearing the document was factual according to al-Ḥillī he would have certainly rebuked him to no end. If truth be told al-Ḥillī has alleviated any concern for the Ahl al-Sunnah in this matter. In any case Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī's objection has been dealt with by the narrations of the Shīʿah in this case. His seniors did not even dream of the fabrications he has thought up.

As far as al-Wāqidī is concerned, the scholars of ḥadīth consider him to be amongst those who fabricated narrations. Ibn al-Jawzī has penned a book specifically

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*.

dealing with fabricated narrations. Reproducing from this book only strengthens our point. If for arguments sake one accords any merit to the narration, then too it must be contextualised as to what purpose the author produced the narration for to fully understand its relevance. Consider the following verse:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ فَقِيرٌ وَنَحْنُ أَغْنِيَاءُ

Indeed, Allah is poor, while we are rich.[1]

Contextualising the verse would clarify it to be a statement of the Jews which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ revealed to refute. The same answer would be given on behalf of Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī for reproducing the narration in question.

The intent to deceive the masses of the Ahl al-Sunnah is quite evident from him referencing books that fall below the tier of acceptance. In order to create confusion and incite evil he has referenced these books illustrating them to be authentic. He also references books that were authored to expose such scams by reproducing fabricated narrations. Over and above this he fabricates narrations whilst referencing obscure books under the assumption that they would not be found or that no one would take on the headache of looking.

Molvī ʿAmmār brought the incident of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا going to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on multiple occasions seeking her inheritance to the fore. This was probably to incite an outcry and claim a win of some sort.

Now consider some more of Molvī ʿAmmār's foolishness. He states:

> **Similarly, if ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah believed the fabricated narration of Abū Bakr regarding the inheritance of the Ambiyā' then why did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ raise this issue once again with ʿUmar during his reign as the khalīfah? On that occasion, ʿUmar told them that they considered Abū Bakr to be a liar, a cheat, a deceiver and a transgressor and they harboured the very same thoughts about him, but he would do nothing more than what Abū Bakr had done about the matter. This narration is recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*.**
>
> **The *Musnad* of Aḥmad records that this matter was raised once again with ʿUthmān during his reign. Therefore, if Abū Bakr was truthful, they would**

1 Sūrah Āl-ʿImrān: 181.

never have claimed Fadak from him. This establishes that Abū Bakr forged the narration and he usurped Fadak from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا due to his hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt. Similarly, ʿUmar highlighted to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that they considered Abū Bakr to be a fraud and a liar and they have the same sentiments for him. So, when ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ considers them to be liars and cheats, then we will do the same. This is the true narrative regarding the Fadak Estate.

The Narration of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim

If one studies the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, one will come to the realization that the assertion Molvī ʿAmmār makes is built upon the need to deceive and a desire to misguide the masses. The meeting which he refers to, was convened to discuss the management of the lands, not its ownership. The narration he cited, the narration of Mālik ibn Aws, and other narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* make this quite clear. He did not grasp this either due to his dim-wittedness or as a result of blindly accepting and regurgitating the statements of his predecessors.

Citing these narrations would prove time-consuming as they require much explanation, especially the lengthy narration of Mālik ibn Aws and time is of the essence. I will, however, provide a brief explanation in light of one of the narrations, to quell any nagging doubts. The narration of ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا which appears a little after the narration cited, highlights the fact that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had given over management of those endowments to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا which were in the vicinity of Madinah and its surrounds. As for the Fadak and Khaybar Estates, he had kept those under his own supervision. In the narration cited by Molvī ʿAmmār it seems as though ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is seeking an undertaking on an oath from ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا to do just as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did. However, the narration of ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا explains that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had taken over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Hereunder is the wording of the narration:

فأما صدقته بالمدينة، فدفعها عمر إلى علي، وعباس، فغلبه عليها علي

> So far as the charitable endowments at Madīnah were concerned, ʿUmar handed them over to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās, but ʿAlī got the better of him (and kept the property under his exclusive management).[1]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

Since ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had taken over the exclusive management of the endowment which was initially handed over to both him and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they had a falling out. Both of them then approached ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ themselves to resolve the matter. They had also sent ʿUthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām, and Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ before their arrival in order to facilitate a resolution. Molvī ʿAmmār has taken this and ran with it trying to prove a claim of inheritance from Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by them since they had an exchange of words with him at this time.

When these six individuals came to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and raised this matter, he asked them under oath if they knew that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had said:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

They all responded in the affirmative that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had indeed said so. After much discussion ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said:

ثم جئتني أنت وهذا وأنتما جميع وأمركما واحد، فقلتما: ادفعها إلينا، فقلت: إن شئتم دفعتها إليكما على أن عليكما عهد الله أن تعملا فيها بالذي كان يعمل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فأخذتماها بذلك، قال: أكذلك؟ قالا: نعم، قال: ثم جئتماني لأقضي بينكما، ولا والله لا أقضي بينكما بغير ذلك حتى تقوم الساعة، فإن عجزتما عنها فرداها إلي،

Then you as well as he came to me. Both of you have come and your purpose is identical.

You said, "Entrust the property to us."

I said, "If you wish that I should entrust it to you, it will be on the condition that both of you will undertake to abide by a pledge made with Allah that you will use it in the same way as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ used it."

So, both of you got it.

ʿUmar said, "Wasn't it like this?"

They said, "Yes."

ʿUmar said, "Then you have (again) come to me with the request that I should adjudge between you. No, by Allah. I will not give any other judgment

except this until the Last Hour. If you are unable to hold the property on this condition, return it to me."[1]

Let us assume for a moment that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا came to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ seeking inheritance and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ further apportioned for them the endowments as inheritance. Then why would ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ despite being 'infallible' [according to the Shīʿah] usurp the share of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? Do the Shīʿah believe ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be so lowly that whatever came his way he wolfed down? Or do the Shīʿah perhaps believe infallibility gives one the licence to oppress with impunity.

ʿAlī undertaking sole management proves the endowments ineligible for inheritance

Looking at this incident through the eye glass of impartiality and considering the fact that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ took over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be the sole administrator of the endowments is clear evidence that the lands did not form part of any estate suitable for inheritance. The estate was in fact an endowment. This is notwithstanding one administrator taking over the administration of another, a resolution of prudence rather than oppression, based upon the vision of growth of the endowment in order to fulfill its original purpose; its proceeds a boon to the poor. This difference in vision for the endowment led to the conflict between ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.

Having understood the above, it cannot be any clearer that the lands were under the administration of ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا and not under their ownership. Thus, their fallout was based upon the administration which they took to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to resolve. The resolution offered by ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was simple; continue administrating as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had done. This was after them and the others having attested to it not being part of any inheritance. Reflect for a moment. What was the need for them to be given a set of instructions regarding the lands if they had ownership of it through the agency of inheritance? If one owns a land, he may do so as he pleases. The reality of the matter is that since they did not have ownership, rather only administration, they were bound by the rules of the endowment.

Further, ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ stating he would not pass any other judgment till the Day of Judgment reinforces the notion that he had handed over the endowments to ʿAlī and

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا to administer and not in ownership. If they had actually inherited the land, then the resolution to their conflict would have been to allocate to them their portion of land, an uncomplicated task. In reality his reasoning for not allocating specific pieces of land to administer was to avoid future generational claims of ownership to the lands. With the passing of time people may come to think of the lands to be the inheritance of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on whose behalf ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ spoke and of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, thus claiming ownership of lands that were in fact not theirs.

ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا attest to the honesty of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Upon being asked on oath, both ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا attested to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is sadaqah.

Then based on what logic could they have sought inheritance from the Prophetic Estate? Only the Shīʿah can come up with such convoluted mental gymnastics to reach such a conclusion.

Molvī ʿAmmār states, as discussed previously, that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had written a document restoring Khaybar to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا which ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tore to pieces. If, for a moment, we consider this to be true then why would ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا go to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his reign seeking inheritance that he had already denied so strongly when he wasn't in the seat of khilāfah? It would be an obtuse assumption to think them so foolish to re-visit a discussion at time when they would have been at a significant disadvantage. It is therefore quite evident that their approaching him from the very first instance was in the capacity of administering the endowments and not to seek it as inheritance. The wording of the narration lends strength to this as well. They said:

ادفعها إلينا

Entrust the property to us.

Which shows that from the beginning they sought to administer it, not own it.

Still, the question of what benefit it was to them to administer the endowment remains. After much thought, the following comes to mind and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى

knows best. The relatives of the Prophet ﷺ held a preemptive share in the revenue generated from the prophetic endowments, and the excess going to the other categories of recipients, especially in endowments of fay'. An indication to this is made by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ in mentioning them first amongst the recipients and the aḥādīth also suggest the same.

However, the khalīfah was preoccupied in more pressing matters of the state and was not solely focused on the administration of the endowments. Further, those with a greater interest in a matter would give it its due right. Keeping the above in mind ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا petitioned to administer the endowment and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ acceded. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also understood that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا would have a better idea of who was needy amongst the Banū Hāshim and who was not and, thus, they were better suited to administer the endowment and its revenue. He also knew that there was no fear of someone thinking of this to be a transaction of ownership as the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was well known and widely circulated. He did, however, refrain from giving them specific shares within the endowment to administer, fearing future generational claims of ownership via the inheritance of Fāṭimah and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.

Yes, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ refused handing over the administration of the endowments since the incident of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا having asked for her inheritance was fresh in the minds of people. The narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was not well known and had he given over its administration it would have been construed as him giving over the prophetic endowments as inheritance.

The superlatives cheat, deceiver and, transgressor was hyperbole—a figure of speech

ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ refuted suppositions and rejected misunderstandings that that had trickled down to the masses. By using hyperbole, he made clear that since ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ accepted the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah

They did not actually believe Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a cheat, deceiver, and a transgressor. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ further stated the reality of the matter which they all agreed on by saying:

والله يعلم إنه لصادق بار راشد تابع للحق

> And Allah knows that he was true, virtuous, well-guided, and a follower of truth.

Such figures of speech are quite common at times of misunderstandings between friends and family as well. If on the other hand ʿAmmār ʿAlī wants to misconstrue this and insinuate something else, then this is down to him singing untruths or due to him being innately dense.

Hyperbole and exaggeration are found even in Qur'ānic verses and the aḥādīth. Take for example the following verse:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا اسْتَيْأَسَ الرُّسُلُ وَظَنُّوْا أَنَّهُمْ قَدْ كُذِبُوْا جَاءَهُمْ نَصْرُنَا فَنُجِّيَ مَنْ نَّشَاءُ وَلَا يُرَدُّ بَأْسُنَا عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْمُجْرِمِيْنَ

> *[They continued] until, when the Messengers despaired and were certain that they had been denied, there came to them Our victory, and whoever We willed was saved. And Our punishment cannot be repelled from the people who are criminals.*[1]

From the apparent of this verse, it seems as though the Prophets despaired in the promises of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and came to think of the promises of His help to be false. However, the believers are acutely aware that such thoughts of despondency and dejection is far removed from the status of the Prophets. In the verses preceding this Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

إِنَّهُ لَا يَيْأَسُ مِنْ رَّوْحِ اللّٰهِ إِلَّا الْقَوْمُ الْكَافِرُوْنَ

> *Indeed, no one despairs of relief from Allah except the disbelieving people.*[2]

Then how can any believer think the Prophets would despair?

---

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 110.

2 Sūrah Yūsuf: 87.

If we were to follow the logic of ʿAmmār ʿAlī in asserting Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a cheat etc., then considering Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is more truthful than ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ one would have to assert under the ruling of the above verse that the Prophets, due to their despondency, were in fact disbelievers. [May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى save us from such folly.]

Generally, the word *Ẓann* is used in the Qur'ān to state false assertions that have entered the heart and have become belief. Consequently, the false assertion of the disbelievers that they will not be resurrected and that no one has the ultimate power to take life is referred to in Sūrah al-Jāthiyah using the same word:

إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّوْنَ

They are only assuming.[1]

The disbelievers had no doubt in this belief of theirs; however, due to the assertion being false, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى referred to it using the word *Ẓann*. Similar is the use in the verse:

إِنَّهُ ظَنَّ أَنْ لَّنْ يَحُوْرَ

Indeed, he had thought he would never return [to Allah].[2]

If we apply this rule of use to the principle verse under discussion, *were certain that they had been denied*, then ʿAmmār ʿAlī would have to concede that the Prophets belief in the help of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was false.

On the other hand, if we take the colloquial meaning of the word *Ẓann*, which is used to denote either an overpowering thought or a doubt, then it would mean the Prophets had no conviction in the promises of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, rendering them disbelievers and anyone following them misguided and ruined. [May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى save us from such folly].

Another possible interpretation is that the *Ẓann* of Prophets was in relation to the delay of assistance and not in relation to the truth of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. If this is taken to be the case, it would reveal uncertainty on their part in the revelation. An

1 Sūrah al-Jāthiyah: 24.

2 Sūrah al-Inshiqāq: 14.

allegation that neither we nor the Shīʿah would be willing to accept, since if they don't have conviction in the revelation then who would?

The only remaining explanation is that due to natural human instinct, a fear passed through the heart—which takes nothing away from their concrete faith—and was expressed with the word *Ẓann*—a figure of expression by way of hyperbole. Then this is exactly what we have been saying with regards to the statement of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

In conclusion, the verse does not establish despair in Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ on the part of the Prophets عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام nor does it insinuate doubt in the revelation they received. It was a figure of expression by way of hyperbole wherein lay advice to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to not fall into such thoughts or for some other reason. There are many other verses of this nature as well, which if taken out of context and without understanding its purport may be blasphemous.

Now contextualise the statement of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in a similar manner. If due to natural human instinct, ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا felt slighted and their sentiments were exaggerated by ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in order for them to realise the shallow nature of their negative sentiment, whilst affirming the positive attitude that always had, then there remains no issue. He used a method of expression found in the Qur'ān.

Another point to note is that since it was ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who made these statements, he could have been mistaken. Perhaps ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا did not feel slighted in the least.

Double standards

It is sad to see that without grasping the context, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is quick to point a nasty finger at Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ through an understated insinuation that could perhaps be attributed to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whereas on the other hand, when ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ himself emphasises the virtue of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by taking oaths, he turns a blind eye.

The disbelief and double standards of the Shīʿah burns through here, the smoke of their deceit visible for all to see. When it comes to vilifying Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then even ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a worthy reference. And when it comes to praising him, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ too is pushed aside. In the very same narration that ʿAmmār ʿAlī references, ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ uses the very same superlatives to describe ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

used[1]. Why doesn't he reproduce that portion of the narration as well? The intent is clear; all he wants is to vilify Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

The manner in which the Shīʿah conduct themselves is just like that of the Banī Isrā'īl. They saw thousands of miracles, but they refused to reform and yet they saw one trick of Sāmirī and they believed in him.

After this explanation ʿAmmār ʿAlī might have come to realise the foolishness of his idiotic objection. And if due to his stupidity, he fails to come to this realisation and persists that ʿUmar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ statement is to be understood literally, at its face value, then we call on him to consider the following.

The incident of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ returning to find the people worshiping the calf is famous. His could not see the law of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى being broken and the sentiment of his īmān erupted. He saw the people worshiping the calf and he thought that perhaps Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was complicit or that he did not try to prevent them. As a result of this misgiving he grabbed Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ by the hair of his head and beard. This act of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was not an emotional outburst, it was a result of a thought pattern which came to one of two suppositions; Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ being complicit or him not preventing the Banī Isrā'īl from falling into calf worship.

As we know, the conclusion Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ came to was incorrect—a misunderstanding. Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was neither complicit nor did he shirk in his responsibility of preventing the people from calf worship. Nevertheless, based on his misunderstanding he reacted in the manner he did.

Now, reflect: If an infallible can have such misgivings regarding another infallible that it leads to a physical altercation, then what is the issue if ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had a suspicion regarding Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The Ahl al-Sunnah have no issue with such a possibility as they do not believe Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be infallible, nor do they believe ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be infallible.

Further, this is only valid if what ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said was indeed the sentiment within the heart of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which in reality was the conjecture of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ at best, and that too an expression of conjecture by way of hyperbole!

---

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757

فقال عباس: يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بيني وبين هذا الكاذب الآثم الغادر الخائن

Lay this conjecture on one side of the weighing scale and in the other place the unequivocal acceptance of the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

By ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ together with his over-reaching praise of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and decide. A foregone conclusion no doubt; ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a devotee of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

If ʿAmmār ʿAlī still persists, then by way of his logic he should clearly say that Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was involved in polytheism and sin by being implicit in the worship of the calf or by not preventing anyone from doing so. And since the Shīʿah believe that an infallible is infallible from misunderstandings too, they should slam Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ as well, since his act was based on a misunderstanding.

Intricate questions and answers—a dilemma

There is always a dilemma when addressing intricate questions with perhaps even more intricate answers. I am apprehensive that one may misunderstand the actual meaning of the content and—even unwittingly—lead themselves astray. However, the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth can also be subject to erroneous interpretation by which one may be led astray. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيْرًا وَيَهْدِيْ بِهِ كَثِيْرًا وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِيْنَ

He misleads many thereby and guides many thereby. And He misleads not except the defiantly disobedient.[1]

Therefore, I have decided it prudent and necessary to pen down some further thoughts to expound on two objections that could be brought forth.

Our discussion will revolve around a portion the narration of Malik ibn Aws as recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. We have already dealt with some parts of this narration in answering the statements made by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Our object of discussion is that part of the narration wherein ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا:

1 Sūrah Baqarah: 26.

فلما توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال أبو بكر أنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فجئتما تطلب ميراثك من ابن أخيك، ويطلب هذا ميراث امرأته من أبيها فقال أبو بكر قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما نورث ما تركناه صدقة فرأيتماه كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا

When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, Abū Bakr said, "I am the successor of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ."

Both of you came, you (referring to ʿAbbās) seeking your inheritance from your nephew, and him (referring to ʿAlī) seeking inheritance on behalf of his wife from her father.

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه said, "The Messenger of Allah ﷺ had said, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.' So, both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest."[1]

This raises two objections against the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Two Objections

1. The first objection is that the Ahl al-Sunnah consider ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما to be narrators of the ḥadīth:

   لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

   We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

   However, from here it seems as though they had no prior knowledge of the narration. If they were aware of it, why would they seek inheritance? The Ahl al-Sunnah cannot fathom ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما would seek inheritance whilst having heard this narration from the Prophet ﷺ.

2. The second objection is the wording *your inheritance and inheritance on behalf of his wife*, and in reply to which Abū Bakr narrated the ḥadīth, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.". This clearly shows that they came seeking 'inheritance'. And since they were not aware of the narration, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah' Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه informed them of it. Upon which they [supposedly]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757.

thought him a liar, sinful, treacherous, and dishonest for withholding their inheritance. This is because withholding someone's inheritance is cheating them of it.

If the narration showed that they came seeking to administer the estates from Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ as they had sought from ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ, there would be no issue since preventing one from administering is no oppression. There is no right to administer. The khalīfah has a choice in the matter.

The second objection is dealt with first, followed by an answer to the first objection.

Answering the second objection

Consider the answers to these objections carefully.

The first answer

The literal (*Ḥaqīqī*) meaning of *Mīrath* is 'to stand in place of'. However, in the usage of the jurists it has come to mean 'inheritance'. As such there is nothing wrong in taking the meaning of the word in these exchanges in its original literal usage. If we do so, then there remains no objection. It would mean that they came to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ seeking to administer the estate and not to inherit it.

The second answer

If we do not take the word in its *Ḥaqīqī* meaning, then it can also be in its metaphorical (*Majāz Mutaʿāraf*[1]) meaning. The Qur'ān has used this metaphorical meaning extensively. Consider the following verses:

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلّٰهِ يُوْرِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Indeed, the earth belongs to Allah. He causes to inherit it whom He wills of His servants. And the [best] outcome is for the righteous.[2]

وَ اَوْرَثْنَا الْقَوْمَ الَّذِيْنَ كَانُوْا يُسْتَضْعَفُوْنَ مَشَارِقَ الْاَرْضِ وَ مَغَارِبَهَا الَّتِيْ بٰرَكْنَا فِيْهَا

1 A metaphorical meaning which has become the commonly understood connotation of the word.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 128.

And We caused the people who had been oppressed to inherit the eastern regions of the land and the western ones, which We had blessed.[1]

The explanation of the metaphorical usage within these two verses has already passed under the chapter: Inheritance also refers to successor.

Consider a third verse as well:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَرِثُ الْأَرْضَ وَمَنْ عَلَيْهَا وَإِلَيْنَا يُرْجَعُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who will inherit the earth and whoever is on it, and to Us they will be returned.[2]

It is clear that this verse is not in the meaning of 'inheritance', it is in the meaning of 'to be in place of' which is the basic understanding of administering or managing. The manager is in the place of the one making the endowment.

According to this usage, in our case of *your inheritance and inheritance on behalf of his wife* ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ is stating to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا that they wanted to administer the Prophet's صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ estate.

The above two answers are considering the word Mīrath to not be in its colloquial usage.

The third answer

If for the sake of the Shīʿah we take the meaning of *mīrāth* in its colloquial usage and deem all other meanings far-fetched, then too it would continue giving the same meaning that we have already established. It is possible that ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ referred to 'administering' as 'inheritance' by way of comparison (*tashbīh*) to the close family relations. The common feature of which is quite evident.

Nonetheless, if one takes a meaning besides the original stipulated meaning and then finds any external factor that influences such usage, taking it back to its original stipulated meaning, then the word will accept such influence. In our study, the external influence is blindingly evident as just a few lines before ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا affirmed that the Prophet صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did in fact say:

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 137.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 40.

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

An objection to the three answers

Question: We accept that all three answers have their merit; however, one question remains: Since ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were in fact seeking to administer the estate and not inherit it, why did Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reply to their request with the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

Since there is no doubt that *inherit* in this narration is in its colloquial meaning, what relation does it have with administering?

Answer: There are two types of answers, *Muṭābiqī*[1] and *Iltizāmī*[2]. In this instance the answer was given in the form of the latter to emphasise the importance of them not taking even the administration of the estate at that time as this could be misconstrued by others and by future generations as inheritance given. The consequence of this would be future generational claims of inheritance in an endowment.

Answering the first objection

If we assume, as the Shīʿah do, that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا had come to seek inheritance, then why did they do so after having heard the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ say, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah"?

The reason for this is simple. They had forgotten the narration and when Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrated it they remembered. Forgetting something doesn't put a blight on ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ integrity. Even the great Prophets forgot. Consider the following examples.

---

1 A corresponding answer in harmony with the question posed.

2 Presenting an answer as the necessary consequence of a claim in order to refute or affirm the claim itself.

- Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام

  Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says regarding Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام:

  وَلَقَدْ عَهِدْنَا إِلَىٰ آدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِيَ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهُ عَزْمًا

  And We had already taken a promise from Ādam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.[1]

  If Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, being the Prophet of Allah, can forget an emphasised command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in comparison is only an Imām. A child of Ādam who had, as all children of Ādam have, inherited his innate forgetfulness. The fact they forgot a general statement of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is not to their detriment in the least.

- Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام

  When Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام travelled under the tutelage of Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام the latter impressed upon Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام not to question his actions until he himself explains. This incident has been mentioned at length in Sūrah Kahf. Nevertheless, when Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام saw things that did not make sense to him, he forgot that he had given his word to Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to not question him. When he saw Khiḍr damaging the vessel of those who had taken them aboard he said:

  أَخَرَقْتَهَا لِتُغْرِقَ أَهْلَهَا لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا إِمْرًا

  Have you torn it open to drown its people? You have certainly done a grave thing.[2]

  He implored Khiḍr of the good they had done to them and the fact that he is repaying them by damaging their vessel! Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said to him:

  أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا

  Did I not say that with me you would never be able to have patience?[3]

---

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115.

2 Sūrah Kahf: 71.

3 Sūrah Kahf: 72.

Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام then presented his excuse stating:

قَالَ لَا تُؤَاخِذْنِيْ بِمَا نَسِيْتُ وَلَا تُرْهِقْنِيْ مِنْ أَمْرِيْ عُسْرًا

*Do not blame me for what **I forgot** and do not cover me in my matter with difficulty.*[1]

In essence, even though it was impressed upon him, he forgot so quickly. So then for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to forget a general statement after a lengthy period of is quite understandable and not at all implausible.

- The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

If the Shīʿah aren't happy with the examples of Adam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, then consider the example of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says addressing the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

وَاذْكُرْ رَّبَّكَ إِذَا نَسِيْتَ

And remember your Lord when you forget.[2]

This clearly shows the possibility of forgetting on the part of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In fact, the reason for the revelation of this verse was that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had promised to say something to the disbelievers the following day and forgot to say *In Shā Allāh* (if Allah wills). Upon this Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى advised the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in this manner.

Furthermore, the authentic Shīʿah books such as *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī and *Tahdhīb* of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī mention, by way of chains of narrators considered authentic, that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made a mistake in ṣalāh, reading two instead of four. Well, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could make a mistake in a matter related to Dīn, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is but of his Ummah.

Thus, it is plainly obvious that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا having heard the narration themselves, forgot; not remembering it at the time. The reason for this is also evident. Since in every single other case across the world inheritance is distributed to the heirs, it is quite plausible if the heirs of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forgot and sought their inheritance.

---

1 Sūrah Kahf: 73.

2 Sūrah Kahf: 24.

However, when Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reminded them, they remembered. This is why when ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ made them both administrators of the estate, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ took over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If they really thought it to be inheritance, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have foregone his right for the right of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as the latter was an actual heir whilst ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not; he was a representative of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Over and above this, if he truly considered it to be inheritance, he would have distributed it amongst the heirs during his khilāfah. He would have given the noble consorts of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ their shares, the children of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ their share and so on. He did not distribute any of it though. He administered it as it always had been administered. This has already been established through sources of both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah. There remains no other explanation besides this: When Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reminded them, they remembered and they further affirmed this in the presence of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Why then the friction between them and Abū Bakr?

The final part of this puzzle is that why did ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ attribute resentment on their part for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ since there was no reason for it? The reason for this assumption of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was that although they knew they weren't heirs to the endowments, they still did believe that they had the right to administer the endowments. However, as we know Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ retained administration of the endowment which led to this friction. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to know of this or deduced that they felt this way regarding this issue and so made the statement that he did. They on the other hand, opted to not respond knowing well the impartiality and reasoning of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. And Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knows best the truth of the matter.

This concludes the section discussing the ḥadīth of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and exploring all its angles. Anyone of sound mind who studies it, even if gone astray through foul company, will find his way to the straight path. And if not then we say:

مَنْ يُضْلِلِ اللّٰهُ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ وَيَذَرُهُمْ فِيْ طُغْيَانِهِمْ يَعْمَهُوْنَ

Whoever Allah sends astray, there is no guide for him. And He leaves them in their transgression, wandering blindly.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 186.

There still remains the last bit of senselessness of ʿAmmār ʿAlī that needs to be addressed. We will respond in a manner that won't only break the teeth of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his elders but will completely stitch their mouths shut.

Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا refused to speak to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا not attend her funeral

Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī states:

> ***Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* adds that when Abū Bakr refused to hand over Fadak then Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا became angry and refused to speak to him ever again. Similarly, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim records that when she was leaving this world, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar should not attend her funeral ceremony**

This is the last portion of the letter and the last of the tricks in his bag. Those with some understanding will clearly realize that after all that has been written, especially the indication of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ being excluded from its purport—as well as the verse, *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored) which establishes Fadak and other estates to be endowments—there could be absolutely no reproach against Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for not handing over Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

Really though this should be ammunition for the Shīʿah, Khawārij, and Nawāṣib to vilify Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا who requested inheritance from an endowment and further cut of relations with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. More so the Shīʿah, who consider her infallible. The truth, however, can never be challenged.

The Ahl al-Sunnah though, lay their cards bare. Just as they consider Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ beyond reproach in this matter, so too do they consider Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا beyond reproach. Neither of their actions render them blame worthy, nor does it affect the integrity of their faith.

The entire ummah is dependent on the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in understanding the Qur'ān

Pay attention now. Fāṭimah al-Zahrā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is not only the Queen of all women. She is in fact the leader of the pious. Her virtues are immense. True love for her is the way to eternal salvation and true faith in her raises one's stages. However,

she is still an individual of the Ummah, she was not a Prophet. Like the rest of the Ummah, she was also in need of Prophetic explanation to understand the purport of the Qur'ān. Merely understanding the language and having a deep intellect does not allow one to understand the intricacies of the Qur'ān. The only way to understand the correct meaning of the Qur'ānic verses is through the explanation of the receiver of revelation, the seal of the Prophets, the Prophet ﷺ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

كَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا فِيْكُمْ رَسُوْلًا مِّنْكُمْ يَتْلُوْ عَلَيْكُمْ اٰيَاتِنَا وَيُزَكِّيْكُمْ وَيُعَلِّمُكُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

Just as We have sent among you a Messenger from yourselves reciting to you Our verses and purifying you and teaching you the Book and wisdom.[1]

Contemplate over this verse. The first portion of the verse, i.e. *reciting to you Our verses*, represents the Prophet ﷺ teaching the manner of recitation. The second portion of the verse, i.e. *and purifying you*, represents the Prophet ﷺ rectifying and purifying the believers—an indication to reforming the internal self from maladies of the heart. The next part of the verse is *and teaching you the Book and wisdom*. Even if we do not consider the colloquial usage of *Taʿlīm* being for the knowledge of meaning, the fact that it comes after *reciting to you Our verses* clearly demonstrate that this portion of the verse deals with the meaning of the Qur'ān.

Further analysis of the verse shows that the pronoun in *and teaching you* applies to the entire Ummah and to a greater degree those Muslims who had the blessed opportunity of his Companionship. The word *Minkum (from yourselves)* is reminiscent of this. These points illustrate that everyone is dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the meaning of the Qur'ān. Another notable point here is that true understanding of the meanings of the Qur'ān can only be achieved by one who has purified his inner self. It is for this reason that *and teaching you the Book* came after *and purifying you*. There are many other verses of the Qur'ān that support this as the people of knowledge will be aware.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 151.

The Prophet ﷺ is excluded from the verse, And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little

Allah ﷻ addressing all of mankind besides the Prophet ﷺ says:

وَمَا أُوْتِيْتُمْ مِّنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيْلًا

And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little.[1]

The opening portion of this verse is clear in that the Prophet ﷺ has been instructed to pass on this verse to the Ummah as a Messenger and is not included in its address:

وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الرُّوحِ قُلِ الرُّوحُ مِنْ أَمْرِ رَبِّي وَمَا أُوْتِيْتُمْ مِّنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيْلًا

And they ask you, [O Muḥammad], about the soul. Say, "The soul is of the affair of my Lord. And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little."

Of course, we do not say nor do we believe that the Prophet ﷺ understands the intricacies and hidden meanings of the Qur'ān as Allah ﷻ does; however, there is no doubt that he understands the Qur'ān much better than anyone else. Anyone who ponders over the Qur'ān will find other verses too with the same subject matter.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the Qur'ān

In any case, whether Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being dependant on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the Qur'ān is directly established from the Qur'ān or not, the Ahl al-Sunnah undoubtedly believe this to be the case. No textual or logical proof can or has been presented in opposition to this. And how can it? Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in the understanding of the Qur'ān is clearer than daylight. It needs no proof.

Based on this, is it possible for her to have made a mistake in understanding a particular verse either due to not having heard its explanation from the Prophet

1 Sūrah al-Isrā: 85.

ﷺ or due to not having understood its finer details? This is not impossible by any stretch of the imagination.

Taking this into consideration, if Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه or even any present-day scholar understands some finer detail of the Qur'ān—based on Prophetic instruction—which Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها did not understand then what harm is it? This would not lower the status of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, and neither would it warrant others being superior to her.

If understanding one particle of knowledge that another does not, results in the former being superior to the latter, then Khiḍr would have been superior to Mūsā عليه السلام. Though Khiḍr damaged the vessel and killed the boy by the command of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, Mūsā عليه السلام did not understand its wisdom whilst Khiḍr did. Now as the scholars know, the correct view is that Khiḍr was not a Prophet and even if he was, then by the consensus of the Ummah, Mūsā عليه السلام is superior in rank to Khiḍr عليه السلام.

The incident of Dāwūd عليه السلام making a mistake in the case of the farmer and Sulaymān عليه السلام understanding its correct judgment is well known and mentioned in the Qur'ān. At the time of this incident Sulaymān عليه السلام was not yet a Prophet whilst Dāwūd عليه السلام was, and at that one of the great Prophets. Further, Sulaymān عليه السلام was of a tender age since at the passing of Dāwūd عليه السلام he was only twelve and this incident occurred sometime before that. Thus, if there is a possibility of Dāwūd عليه السلام, one of the great Prophets and the Prophet of the time, making a mistake and a young boy understanding it correctly, then in a similar manner, is it not plausible that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها did not understand an indication in the meaning of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), which could only have been explained by the Prophet ﷺ and yet Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did after having understood it from the Prophet ﷺ?

Gleaning from this, it is possible that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was not even aware of the Fadak Estate being fay', as information of this sort is generally known to the warriors and those receiving the booty. Over and above this, the lands of fay' not being under ownership is understood after pondering deeply on the verse, *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored). Because of not being aware of these finer details, she sought her inheritance from Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه after the passing of the Prophet ﷺ. According to her estimation, before being aware of the finer details, she

assumed the Prophet ﷺ would fall under the general ruling of the verse of inheritance.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها not speaking to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه explained

There are two possible reasons for this.

The first explanation

When Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه narrated the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was filled with remorse and grief. This is because when the Prophets and the devoutly pious do anything slightly out of *their* norm and are alerted to it, they become remorseful. Adam's عليه السلام regret after consuming the wheat, Nūḥ's عليه السلام remorse after praying for the deliverance of his son, and Mūsā's عليه السلام shame after accidentally killing the Qibṭī are all mentioned in the Qur'ān.

Due to this remorse her relationship with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه changed and their previous order of interacting no longer remained. This change though was not defined by a deliberate avoidance of talking and greeting, as such behaviour for more than three days is impermissible—thus extending it for the rest of their life was unthinkable. In any case, the Ahl al-Sunnah do not criticize Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها for the discontinuation of speaking as mentioned in some narrations.

The second explanation

Another possible explanation for the narration that mentions her not talking is that after having heard the ḥadīth:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

Is that she never again raised this issue with him. And why would she? Then there would be no difference between Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and those who hanker after paltry material gains. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the other hand assumed she might have been upset with him and due to the deep seeded love he had for her, he sought ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to implore her on his behalf and she expressed her happiness. This assumption of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is the same assumption that the people carried with them, thinking Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was angry with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Was Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا angry with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

If anyone finds themselves feeling uneasy that in some narrations, there is clear mention of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا being angry with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then they may heed the following answer. In the authentic narrations such as those of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, the wording that appears is *fa wajadat Fāṭimah*. The word *wajadat* carries the meaning of *ghaḍibat* (anger) and also the meaning of *Ḥazinat* (sadness). One may refer to the lexicons and see for themselves. Since this is the case, what is the need to take it in the meaning of anger and stamp the seal of resentment upon Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا?

Discussing the preposition of Wajadat

If someone says that sure, we agree that the word *wajadat* is used in both these meanings. But if followed by the preposition *ʿalā* (upon), then it will give the sole meaning of anger and if followed by the preposition *ba* then there will be leeway to consider it in the meaning of sadness; but in our case *wajadat* is followed by *ʿAlā*.[1]

The answer to this is that every person understands the next person's speech according to his own intellect. This is why *Riwāyah bi al-Maʿnā* (Transmission of ḥadīth by meaning) off all and sundry are not accepted and when accepted is not at the same level of *Riwāyah bi al-Lafẓ* (Transmission of ḥadīth by exact wording), as it is possible that the reality of the matter is something whilst the narrator understood something else.

This is exactly what happened between Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and pondering over one's daily dealings, no doubt proves that instances of this nature occur more often than not. It is therefore possible that the narrator said *fa wajadat Fāṭimah* and the one listening thought Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not speaking due to her being angry instead of her being sad and remorseful. And when narrating, based on his understanding, the narrator added *ʿalā Abī Bakr* (upon Abū Bakr). In any case, as long as there remains the possibility of a credible interpretation, those of intellect should not think ill of the devoutly pious.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

Searching for credible interpretation of the pious and entertaining good thoughts regarding them

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ mentions the incident of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ in the Qur'ān and the acts of Khiḍr, viz. damaging the vessel of those who had taken them aboard and killing the young boy. The objections of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to the perpetration of these acts has also been reproduced in the Qur'ān. One of the insights gleaned from mentioning this, is to understand the manner in which one should react to such acts of the devoutly pious that apparently seem to be contrary to logic or the Sharī'ah. The lesson learned is for one to attribute ill understanding to one's own myopia instead of painting them in a negative light.

The premise of the following saying is the same:

ظنوا المؤمنين خيرا

Think good of the believers.

The intended audience of this saying are those who see complete believers do something which is apparently against the dictates of the Sharī'ah. Yes, one should advise them in a suitable manner in case they have erred; however, the heart should remain free from any negative thoughts. There are verses of the Qur'ān and authentic aḥādīth which discourage and prohibit suspicion [which in turn would mean entertaining good thoughts]. Such instructions only carry their meaning when directed against those who are involved in an act which apparently goes against the dictates of the Sharī'ah. Otherwise what would the point be? In a similar fashion, the incident that occurred between Abū Bakr and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا will be looked at in a positive light, searching for credible interpretation. An exercise worthy of their stature.

If anyone does not agree, then they should first prove our premise wrong. Merely stating a disagreement is not enough of a counter argument. Let them destroy their hereafter in attempting such foolishness.

Assuming Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Assuming Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ over this matter does not make him responsible for it in a manner that seeks to put a blight on his

personality. If anything is established by this, it is that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was mistaken in directing her anger at Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Prophets are infallible, they too have had such misunderstandings between them. Why would the pious then be immune? Hārūn's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ innocence, in the matter of the calf worship that the Banī Isrā'īl were embroiled in, is proven from the Qur'ān. Nevertheless, the incident of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ becoming angry with his brother, to the extent of the altercation becoming physical, is also mentioned in the Qur'ān. Forget Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ being taken to task in this matter, he will in fact be rewarded for his anger; a display of his deep-seeded love for monotheism and worry for the commands of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Well, in a similar manner understand the issue that occurred between Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—the Queen of all women—and Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Both of them are beyond reproach in the matter; in fact, consider them to be rewarded for their actions. For a better understanding of this, turn some pages back and read our dissertation on the verse, *Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.*

If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ made a mistake, the Shīʿah say he repented—discussing the narration of Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn

On the other hand, if we assume for a moment, as the Shīʿah do, that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had made a mistake then he had repented and the one who repents has his mistake effaced. The following narration is famous:

التائب من الذنب كمن لا ذنب له

The one who repents from sin is like one who did not sin.[1]

If someone wants proof that he had repented, then let us provide such proof that even the Shīʿah will tire themselves nodding their head in agreement. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states in *Minhāj al-Kirāmah:*

لما وعظت فاطمة أبا بكر في فَدَك، كتب لها كتاباً بها، وردها عليها

When Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا spoke to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding Fadak, he wrote out a document giving it over to her.

1 *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, Ḥadīth: 4250.

This narration has been recounted a few times now and as the couplet goes:

هو المسك ما كررته يتضوع

The more you apply musk, the more the fragrance.

I look for opportunities to recount this narration; a karāmāt of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. The Shīʿah themselves have adequately answered the accusation they have made with this narration. By this narration, the Shīʿah have expunged their own allegations be it against Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا or Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This narration has totalled their claims of Fadak being her ownership by way inheritance, a gift, a bequest, or any other avenue. This is a manifestation of the verse:

وَكَفَى اللّٰهُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ الْقِتَالَ

And sufficient was Allah for the believers in battle.[1]

If for arguments sake, we assume that this narration is not to be found in a book reliable to the Shīʿah, then there is another that proves Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be innocent. The following narration, which I have been promising to reproduce for some time, appears in the book *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*—a book reliable to the Shīʿah—and other books of the Shīʿah:

> أن أبا بكر لما رأى أن فاطمة انقبضت عنه وهجرته ، ولم تتكلم بعد ذلك في أمر فدك ، كبر ذلك عنده ، فأراد استرضاءها فأتاها فقال لها : صدقت يا ابنة رسول الله فيما ادعيت ، ولكني رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقسمها ، فيعطي الفقراء والمساكين وابن السبيل بعد أن يؤتي منها قوتكم والصانعين بها ، فقالت : افعل فيها كما كان أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يفعل فيها ، فقال : ولك الله على أن أفعل فيها ما كان يفعل أبوك ، فقالت : والله لتفعلن ؟ فقال : والله لأفعلن ذلك ، فقال : اللهم اشهد ، فرضيت ذلك ، وأخذت العهد ، وكان أبو بكر بعطيهم منها قوتهم ويقسم الباقي فيعطي الفقراء والمساكين وابن السبيل
>
> When Abū Bakr noticed Fāṭimah had withdrawn from him and did not speak to him regarding the Fadak Estate again, it pained him. Intending to appease

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 25.

her he came to her and said, "O daughter of the Prophet, you are true in what you claim; however, I saw the Prophet ﷺ distributing it; giving it to the poor, needy, and travelers after your provisions and the revenue workers' earnings had been taken out."

She said, "Continue doing as my father the Prophet ﷺ had done with it."

He said, "I take an oath for you from Allah, to do as your father had done, I will do so."

She asked, "By Allah, will you do so?"

He said, "By Allah, I will do so. O Allah, be my witness."

She was pleased by this and took his oath. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would give them their provisions from it and distribute the rest amongst the poor, needy, and travelers.

This narration holds a few key pieces of information. Firstly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not belie Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها in that it was gifted to her. However, since a gift is incomplete until ownership is transferred—according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah—he excused himself from handing it over. Therefore, even if for arguments sake, the narration of it being gifted was authentic, the Shīʿah complaint of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه belying Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is moot. ʿAmmār ʿAlī has blackened his name by arguing this in his letter to Mīr ʿAlī. Secondly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not personally gain even a grain from the Fadak Estate, distributing to the poor anything left after providing the needs of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

Thus, it becomes quite clear. There was no material motive in not giving over the Fadak Estate. He had definitely heard something from the Prophet ﷺ due to which he held it back. The result of these two issues coming to the fore is clarity on the narration of Umm Ayman and ʿAlī رضي الله عنهما. It is no doubt a fabrication of the Shīʿah. This is because the need for witnesses is only in the event of the possibility of the plaintiff lying.

And if there still remains any doubt of an ulterior motive inspired by not wanting to be hanged by public opinion then, firstly, there is no medication for obsessive doubts built on thin air and, secondly, why are the Shīʿah making it an issue when Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها herself was pleased at how the situation worked out?

A third piece of key information we gain from this narration is that right till the passing of the Prophet ﷺ, the Fadak Estate remained within his supervision and administration. Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها had no oversight or managerial duties of the Estate. Otherwise she would not have responded to his assertion of what the Prophet ﷺ used to do by instructing him to carry on in the same manner. Rather she would have established her ownership and done as she pleased. Possession of the Estate would have been common knowledge and a multitude of people would have supported her claim.

Fourthly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه sincerely wanted Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to have the Fadak Estate. Furthermore, he had no ill feelings towards her, otherwise her being upset would not have troubled him in the least and he wouldn't have made the effort to please her. This premise has already been established under our discussion of the verse, *Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah*; one seeking another's pleasure is a product of love. If someone were to say that his acts were motivated by public opinion, then this is refuted by the wording of the narration "... it pained him. Intending to appease her he came to her". This portrays his anguish and his worry to please her.

Moreover, if he was worried of being labeled dishonorable, this would have been from the camp that disagreed with him, not from those who concurred with his decision, since the latter knew that Fadak was not in the ownership of the Prophet ﷺ and that there is no inheritance in the Prophets effects. As he didn't want any of it for himself, he would have given it over to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, thus silencing any critics. Only the feeble-minded Shīʿah can mount such weak attacks that hold no weight. This narration is a display of his truthfulness and trustworthiness, provided the one reading is cognitively available. What was the need for him to feel troubled since he had complete autonomy to do as he pleased? This anguish of his was a result of his wish to please Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Taking into consideration him not keeping Fadak for himself, nor giving it to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها despite the deep love he had for her and the fact that it would have silenced his critics leaves only one logical explanation: His decision was based upon adhering to the law of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, following the command of the Prophet ﷺ, and taking into consideration the best interest of the faith and the state.

Adhering to the law of Allah سبحانه وتعالى was by understanding and imbibing within his decision the indications of both the verses *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and

Mā Afā' Allāh (what Allah restored). Following the command of the Prophet ﷺ was by following the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and by following the instruction found in the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah." The Shīʿah narrations from the books they deem reliable concur and give strength to these two observances. As for considering the best interests, firstly, the laws of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the commands of the Prophet ﷺ brim with expediency. Secondly, if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had given over the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—based on the assumption of the narration of gifting being authentic—without the divine prerequisites regarding witnesses being fulfilled, in as far as the claim being supported by Umm Ayman, ʿAlī, and even Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, it would have resulted in the establishment of discriminatory law practices based on societal status and a precedent of preferential treatment in Islamic canon till the end of time.

Additionally, since the Fadak Estate remained with the Prophet ﷺ until his last, the gifting was not complete as ownership was not transferred—according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah. Therefore, based on the narration "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", it had become ṣadaqah. If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had given it to her then [Allah forbid] the Prophet ﷺ would have come under the ambit of the ḥadīth:

العائد في صدقته كالكلب يعود في قيئه

One who gets back the charity is like a dog who swallows its vomit.[1]

If the Shīʿah then claim it was not gifted but it was inherited, then just as Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not give it to her in the assumption of it being gifted, similarly it was not possible for him to give it to her assuming it was inheritance. Since the narration "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", is authentic, we learn that on the passing of the Prophet ﷺ all his effects had become ṣadaqah. And if an item is not within the ownership of the deceased, it cannot be inherited. How could Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then embroil himself in such naivety? This would result in the Prophet ﷺ being subjected to the ḥadīth mentioned above and that inheritance has been affected in an item that was not under ownership—resulting in *Ijtimāʿ al-Naqīḍayn* [the coming together of two contradictories].

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1620.

Furthermore, from the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", we learn that the pleasure of the Prophet ﷺ lied in none of his effects being inherited and the pleasure of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was in opposition to this. Stuck between the two Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه gave precedence to the wish of the Prophet ﷺ and acted accordingly. He then made efforts to reconcile with Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and please her as explicitly mentioned in the narration above. This shows his complete adherence to the wish of the Prophet ﷺ and his ability to mend the relationship with Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. He went beyond the call of duty as he was not under obligation to please Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها in fulfilling the wish of the Prophet ﷺ. Besides, if he had given anything over to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, and the Noble Consorts of the Prophet ﷺ would have also asked for their share rendering the ḥadīth pointless and the khilāfah feeble.

The fifth key point of note from the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn* is that even though Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was displeased at some point, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه presented a valid excuse to her and she became pleased with him. It is quite evident that when the displeasure no longer existed and her being happy with him is explicitly mentioned, dredging up the issue of her displeasure makes no sense. All praise belongs to Allah, the issue of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being pleased with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه has been proven from the narrations of the Shīʿah themselves, that too from a book they consider reliable. Over and above that, the narration appears in other books of theirs as well besides it being recorded in *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is pleased according to the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah

The displeasure of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, the agony of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and his seeking the intercession of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه in this regard which resulted in her becoming happy with him has been mentioned in the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. *Madārij al-Nubuwwah*, *Kitāb al-Wafā'*, *al-Bayhaqī*, and *Shurūḥ al-Mishkāt* have recorded such narrations. Shaykh ʿAbd al-Haqq has recorded in *Shurūḥ al-Mishkāt* Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه going to her home after the incident and standing in the sun at her door presenting his explanation, upon which Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها became happy with him. This incident has been mentioned at length in *al-Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah* as well as in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* by way of al-Bayhaqī on the authority of Shaʿbī.

Ibn al-Sammān has recorded in his book *al-Muwāfaqah Bayn Ahl al-Bayt wa al-Ṣaḥābah* on the authority of al-Awzā'ī that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ went to the door of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on a hot day and said, "I will not move from here till the daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is pleased with me." ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then went inside and took an oath from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to be pleased with him which she acquiesced to. From this we can gleam that the Zaydī Shīʿah narrations are also in conformity to the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

An impartial consideration of these narrations will lead one to conclude that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had absolutely no ill-feelings towards the family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Rather, he was fond of them and revered them to the extent of deeming himself their servant even whilst in the seat of khilāfah. The character of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ shows his elevated status, complete truthfulness, and clean heart. If he was hankering after material gain, he would have not gone to such lengths to appease Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nor would she have felt confident in displaying her feelings to him if he was a tyrant ruler.

Barring Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from attending her burial

Taking the above discussions into account, there remains no doubt that if for arguments sake we assume for a moment that she made a bequest for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to stay away from her burial, it was due to her extreme modesty. Because she knew Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ held her in high esteem, he would definitely be present for her burial and so she singled him out. She was aware that he would not let the opportunity of showing solidarity with the Ahl al-Bayt go by under any circumstance and so, as a testament to her modesty, had no other option but to make such a bequest. This was further necessitated as he was the khalīfah, the one responsible for the congregational and funeral prayers.

Her bequest was general

Her bequest was general, barring all non-maḥram men, which is why she made a bequest to be buried at night due to her modesty. Her high level of modesty in this matter is proven from authentic narrations in which Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا expressed her discomfort of her shrouded body being transported in front of strange men. The practice in that era was to transport the body of the deceased without a closed casket. Hearing this, Asmā' bint ʿUmays رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا [the wife of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ]

mentioned to her the practice of the Abyssinians of using a covered canopied structure made of date palm branches in which they would transport the deceased. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا requested one be made and showed to her, which Asmā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا did. Upon inspecting it, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was elated and smiled; something she hadn't done since the passing of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا then made a bequest to Asmā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا that she be the one to wash her body with ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being present not allowing any other person to be there. Consider now, how could Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ have been present at her ghusl? In fact, there was no way for anyone else to have been present, neither men, nor women. If she had so much modesty that she would not allow any other women to be present, then it is entirely plausible for to request no men be at her funeral. Owing to this, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ buried her at night without informing anyone.

To recap, she requested no man be present at her funeral without singling out Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. There is no single narration of the Ahl al-Sunnah that alludes to her having barred Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ exclusively. Such false additions to the narrations are a result of the evil ploys of the Shīʿah. Over and above that they have the gall to reference such fabrications to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah! ʿAmmār ʿAlī has traversed all boundaries of shame and academic honesty by referencing such a fabrication to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. He states that narration of her making a bequest to bar Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا from her funeral is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Only Allah knows where such immodesty stems from! Does he not have any shame in making claims that are clear cut lies? *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* isn't a rare book. There are thousands of copies available. Nowhere is this fabrication found. Hereunder is the narration under discussion:

> فلما توفيت دفنها زوجها علي بن أبي طالب ليلا، ولم يؤذن بها أبا بكر، وصلى عليها علي
>
> When she died, her husband. ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, buried her at night. He did not inform Abu Bakr about her death and offered the funeral prayer over her himself.[1]

There is no mention of such a bequest for or after this in the narration. I am lost as to how ʿAmmār ʿAlī came to the conclusion of her bequest barring Abū Bakr and

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا from her funeral based on this. Subḥān Allāh! This is the honesty and trust of the Shīʿah scholars.

In any case, the extent of what has been mentioned in the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ buried Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا at night, did not inform Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of her passing, and performed her funeral prayer himself. There is another view which states that ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and a few of the Ahl al-Bayt performed her funeral prayer and buried her at night. However, the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is only to the extent mentioned, there is no indication to the 'supposed' bequest.

If for arguments sake we assume there was any bequest of this sort, it would have been to bar **all** men from attending her funeral. In some narrations there is mention of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and the other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ going to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ the next day to console him. In this narration there is also mention of them complaining to him for not alerting them to her funeral because of which they missed the opportunity of being present for her funeral procession and prayer. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ responded to them citing the wishes of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to be buried at night so that no strange men will see my funeral procession. He stated his actions was in conformity to her wishes. These narrations clearly relay her wish that no strange men be present at her funeral. There was no exclusivity of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.

The obsessive suspicious predisposition of the Shīʿah is such that no matter the logical or textual proof in front of them, they will always attribute any action or lack thereof of the Ahl al-Bayt to their hate of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Their character has been summed up in the following poem:

> *When a dog is hit with a stone on its head,*
>
> *he wags its tail, maybe it's a bone; his daily bread.*
>
> *And when it sees a dead body being carried by two,*
>
> *he misconstrues it his lunch, to chew.*

To conclude, there is no mention of Abū Bakr or ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا exclusively being barred.

Her funeral prayer was performed by Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

According to the narration of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* the complete opposite is established. The narration states, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا passed away between Maghrib and ʿIshā on the

Tuesday the 3rd of Ramaḍān six months after the Prophet ﷺ, at the age of 28. Abū Bakr, ʿUthmān, and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf رضي الله عنهم were present at the time of ʿIshā and at the wish of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه performed the prayer with four extra *takbīr*. This narration and the attitude of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه clearly rejects any notion of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها making a bequest to bar Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from her funeral. ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه bravery was famed and Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه sublime conduct was well documented. If she had made such a bequest, he would not have shied away from implementing her wish to its fullest extent due to his bravery and there was no need for Taqiyyah in the face of Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه sublime conduct. Thus, there is no narration that speaks of her wish to bar Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Yes, there are narrations that speaks of the general prevention of people from attending her funeral, and if for arguments sake there was any exclusivity for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه then the reasons for such have already been detailed. Based on the assumption that such a narration exists that prevents ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as well, then the reasons for her wish to bar him can be explained by the following. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه enjoyed the status of being privy to the decisions of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and his opinion was highly regarded; he was as a vizier is to a king. Thus, if we assume such a narration exists that specifically bars Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما, it was due to the close relationship they had in the decision-making process [including that of Fadak] and in being with each other most of the time; it would not have been possible to prevent one without the other. Such a bequest would not have been based on any ill feelings or hatred towards Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما.

The logical proof of the premise that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها wished to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from attending her funeral was due to her extreme modesty and not due to ill-feelings is as follows. If it was based on hatred and ill-feelings, it would have been to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to perform her funeral prayer; who was the khalīfah and the one responsible for performing the five daily ṣalāh and the funeral ṣalāh. This does not make sense in any way because according to the consensus of historians, both of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah, at the funeral of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, his brother Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه indicated to Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رضي الله عنه [Muʿāwiyah's رضي الله عنه representative] to perform the prayer citing the Amīr leading the funeral prayer is the sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ and had it not been so he would have not allowed him to lead the prayer. If Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها had made the bequest to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from performing her funeral prayer, Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه would have definitely prevented

Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from performing Ḥasan's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ funeral prayer. This is besides the fact that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ held a much higher status in comparison to Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and in particular in the aspect of leading the prayer. His superiority in leading the prayer is evident from his appointment by the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to lead the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār some six months prior to Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا passing.

To conclude, all evidences, textual and logical, prove that the supposition of the Shīʿah that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا could not tolerate Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ at her funeral is as a result of their nescience. And if we put aside all logical and textual evidences, the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn* is sufficient to demonstrate our point. The said narration clearly shows that even if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا had any ill-feelings towards Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, these feelings were resolved and they were both happy with each other.

If any Shīʿah goes a step further and presumes Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a hypocrite and her display of pleasure a mere front, then this is them projecting their own views. A presumption only they can make heads or tails of.

Nobody's displeasure matters when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are pleased.

If for arguments sake, we consider the Shīʿah stance that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا left this world unhappy with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it doesn't matter since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were pleased with him. Whatever ill-feelings remained is taken care off by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says describing the manner in which the pious will enter paradise:

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِم مِّنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَىٰ سُرُرٍ مُّتَقَابِلِيْنَ

> *And We will remove whatever is in their breasts of resentment, [so they will be] brothers, on thrones facing each other.*[1]

From this verse we learn that ill-feelings do develop between the pious; however, such ill-feelings do not harm them in the least. As they enter Paradise, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will remove any such feelings and any negativity between them will dissipate due to them being residents of Paradise. Thus, if we assume as the Shīʿah, do that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا left this world displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then this verse serves

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 47.

as a glad tiding to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his well-wishers and leaves the eyes of the Shīʿah grating with grit.

Perhaps some hopeless Shīʿah objects to this, stating anyone Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is unhappy with does not fall under the ambit of this verse due to the following narration which both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah accept:

الا ان فاطمة بضعة مني يؤذيني ما آذاها يريبني ما رابها فمن اغضبها اغضبني

Know well, Fāṭimah is a part of me, whatever harms her, harms me, and whatever bothers her, bothers me. Whoever angers her angers me.[1]

The answer to this is that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had already given consideration to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in this ḥadīth. See, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

فمن اغضبها اغضبني

Whoever angers her, angers me.

He did not say:

من غضبتْ غليه غضبتُ عليه

Whoever she gets angry with, I will be angry with.

There is no doubt that anyone who angers her would have done so intentionally by their actions or speech and it is foolish for anyone to think Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ angered her intentionally. In any case, those who were aware of this entire discussion know and those who were not are now in the know.

Looking at the narrations, one finds Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ addressing Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا on many occasions saying:

---

1 The wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 2449, is:

فإنما ابنتي بضعة مني، يريبني ما رابها ويؤذيني ما آذاها

For my daughter is part of me. He who disturbs her in fact disturbs me and he who offends her offends me.

The wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 3714, is:

فاطمة بضعة مني، فمن أغضبها أغضبني

Fatima is a part of me, and whoever angers her, angers me.

والذي نفسي بيده، لقرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أحب إلي أن أصل من قرابتي

By the One in Whose hand is my soul, serving the relatives of the Prophet ﷺ are dearer to me than serving my own relatives.[1]

Since he did not intentionally anger her, in fact always trying to please her, how could he then fall under the warning featured in the above ḥadīth. If there really was any sort of anger, it emanated from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها based on natural predisposition. And if we overlook the details and explanations of such a supposition, it would mean the promise of the verse under discussion will apply to her and any resentment will be removed from the heart of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه angering Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها on numerous occasions

If we assume that her mere anger is sufficient for one to fall under the warning of the ḥadīth then the Shīʿah have their work cut out for them. We do not claim Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be infallible. It is possible for him to have done an act due to which he falls under some warning. However, the Shīʿah believe ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be infallible. What do they say then about Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها becoming angry with ʿAlī رضي الله عنه on numerous occasions regarding their household matters? In fact, if we look at the background to the narration, "Fāṭimah is a part of me...", we find a disagreement between ʿAlī and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما led to the Prophet ﷺ making this statement. The gist of the incident as mentioned in the narrations is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه sent a proposal to the daughter of Abū Jahal upon which Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها went to the Prophet ﷺ crying. Having heard what had transpired the Prophet ﷺ said, "... Fāṭimah is a part of me..." Thus, if by merely angering Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه came under the warning mentioned in the ḥadīth, then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would also be under the same warning. This is because, firstly, the statement made by the Prophet ﷺ was in reference to him and, secondly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was excused from giving Fadak due to divine law, [though he wished it remained by her if it wasn't against the command of Allah سبحانه وتعالى as understood from the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*] whilst ʿAlī رضي الله عنه wasn't forced to marry the daughter of Abū Jahal.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: 3712.

Similarly, on one occasion ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ left the house upset, and fell asleep in the masjid on the bare ground with no pillow or covering. When the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ came to know of this he went to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and asked her of the whereabouts of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا responded saying he had an argument with her and left the house, not coming home for the afternoon siesta either.

Both these incidents have been narrated in books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the books of the Shīʿah.

Sending a proposal was no sin and anger was a human reaction

Besides the point already extrapolated from the first incident, another issue comes to fore as well. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was human after all and she would become angry which is a natural human emotion. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not committing a sin by intending to marry the daughter of Abū Jahal, it was in conformity to the commands of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Her becoming angry at his intent was as a result of human emotion. In fact, the common factor in both incidents is that even an 'infallible' can become angry as a result of them being human. Because both ʿAlī and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were 'infallible', neither of them can be taken to task for their arguments and anger. All that can be said is due to human predisposition one had a misgiving about the other which resulted in them inadvertently becoming angry and losing consideration of the others 'infallibility'.

In a similar manner, it is not far-fetched to accept Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا became angry with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a result of her humanness. Nevertheless, what becomes abundantly clear is that if one did not intend to anger Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, they will not fall under the warning mentioned in the ḥadīth. Besides, it is well noted that Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ became angry with his elder brother Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ; a Prophet in his own right, to the extent that he physically assaulted him by grabbing him by his hair and beard. It is also common knowledge that Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did not intend to anger Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ since intentionally angering a Prophet is disbelief. Then too Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ evidently became angry.

From this we learn that if due to human nature one *becomes* angry with another, it is not considered *making* another angry. This is exactly the essence of the incident between Abū Bakr and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. He did not anger her; if anything, she *became* angry. Conversely, one may tentatively undertake the assumption that if anyone

made her angry, it might have been ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as he was her husband and would not have had the same amount of reverence for her that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ angering her is also supported by the context of the narration, "... Whoever angers her...".

Hence, since Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not make her angry, to deem him under the warning of the ḥadīth will land the one with this assumption under the warning of the ḥadīth himself.

One adopting problematic and illegitimate beliefs will no doubt displease Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Further, it will displease the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ double-fold. Due to his own displeasure and due to displeasing Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. This, without a shadow of doubt, is *making* her angry and not her *becoming* angry due to human nature. It can therefore be unquestionably established that one who vilifies Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ falls under the warning of "...Whoever angers her...". Those who adopted these illegitimate beliefs and died while having vilified Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are gone. However, Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the rest of the Shīʿah should worry about themselves and remove themselves from these erroneous beliefs. They should turn to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى seeking His forgiveness in a bid to make up for their transgressions. If they don't listen, that's their problem.

It is time to conclude now, as there is nothing left of ʿAmmār ʿAlī's foolishness that hasn't been sufficiently answered in this book, through the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Hence, I conclude with the following words:

> الحمد لله رب العلمين والصلوة والسلام على سيّد المرسلين وعلى آله واصحابه وازواجه واهل بيته وذريته اجمعين – والمرجو منك يا ارحم الراحمين ان تتقبل هذه الرسالة مني وتجعله وسيلة لي الى رضائك ورضاء رسولك صلى الله عليه وسلم ورضاء اهل بيته ورضاء صاحبه في الغار سيّدنا ابي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه ومن سواه من اصحابه صلى الله عليه وسلم رضوان الله عليهم اجمعين وان تغفرلي وترحمني بهذه الاوراق في الدنيا والآخرة مغفرة ورحمة تحيط بها والدي وآبائى الماضين وذريتي واقاربي واحبابي خصوصاً من امرني بالقيام لهذا الامر العظيم برحمتك يا ارحم الراحمين

All praise is for Allah, the Lord of the worlds. Peace and salutations be upon the Master of the Messengers and upon his family, his noble consorts, and children. My hope from You, O Most Merciful of those who have mercy, is to accept from me this book and make it a means to attain Your pleasure, the pleasure of Your Messenger ﷺ, the pleasure of his family, the pleasure of his Companion in the cave Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and the rest of his Companions رضي الله عنهم. My hope from you, by the means of these pages, is to enshroud me, my forefathers, my children, my dear ones, and especially those who have instructed me to take on this great task with your forgiveness and mercy, O Most Merciful of those who have mercy.

A summary of the answers to the objections of Fadak

Whichever Shīʿah vilifies the first khalīfah due to the Fadak issue will do so by either claiming it to be gifted or inherited. In each case there are three preliminary issues that is necessary for them to establish.

In the case of claiming it to be gifted, the following three preliminary issues have to be established:

1. That the Fadak Estate was in the ownership of the Prophet ﷺ.
2. That the gifting took place.
3. That possession of the gift was taken.

Similarly, in the case of claiming it to be inherited, the following three preliminary issues have to be established:

1. That the Fadak Estate was in the ownership of the Prophet ﷺ.
2. That the link of the Prophet ﷺ to this world has come to an end, that the connection between his body and soul was broken.
3. That the verse:

يُوصِيكُمُ اللَّهُ فِيٓ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

Includes in its purport the Prophet ﷺ in the same manner as it does the rest of the Ummah.

Those cognizant of the sciences of argumentation and deliberation (*Munaẓarah*) will be aware that the Ahl al-Sunnah are defendants in this case and as such aren't obliged to consider any evidence. Merely rejecting the argument is sufficient. Furthermore, rejecting any one of the preliminary issues in either cases is sufficient to render them and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه safe from any reproach forget rejecting all three. And if they refute all three preliminary issues through clear proofs or establish its opposite by way of robust evidences then their view cannot be challenged.

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

Those that have studied this book, *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah*, will be aware that in the case of gifting the last two preliminary issues were not established by the Shīʿah, rather its opposite was established according to the principles of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

In the case of inheritance, even though refuting the second preliminary issue was difficult, I have addressed it adequately in the book *Āb-e-Ḥayāt* which will be published soon, Allah سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَىٰ willing. Any impartial Shīʿah who studies it will begin speaking the truth. As for the people of the truth, the Ahl al-Sunnah, their occupation *is* to recognise the truth as true and falsehood as false.

The first preliminary issue in the case of both gifting and inheriting and the third in the case of inheriting, have been refuted and its opposites established in detail in this book.

The falsehood of the first preliminary issue in both cases is so clear that only a disbeliever with a rotten heart will have any misgivings regarding it. It is for this very reason that when I was working for the Mujtabā'ī publishing house in Meerut [1860-1868] I went to meet the son of Muḥammad Qulī Kuntūrī, Molvī Ḥāmid Ḥusayn—Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī II and successor of Nūr Allāh Shūstarī—when he stayed at the house of Mīr Mahdī ʿAlī in Meerut while on his way to Ludhiana. I raised a few of these issues with him and the renowned Molvī Ṣāḥib was unable to furnish me with any answer.

وَاللّٰهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِيْنَ

And Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.